

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



139 372

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE IMMANENCE OF GOD



MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO
DALLAS • SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.

TORONTO

IMMANENCE OF GOD

IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE

BY

J. ABELSON, M.A., D.LIT.

PRINCIPAL OF ARIA COLLEGE, PORTSMOUTH

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

1912

COPYRIGHT

PREFACE

THE following pages treat of an aspect of ancient Jewish theology which has, as yet, received an all too scant attention. Indeed, the number of modern books dealing with Jewish theology, whether as a whole or under any of its many constituent aspects, is absurdly small. A few distinguished names leap to the mind at once. But admirable and thorough as is the work of these scholars, the output is by no means commensurate with the scope, importance, and complexity of the subject. As a result of this barrenness of production, the theology of Rabbinic Judaism—and hence Judaism itself—has never yet had the good fortune to be weighed in the scales of absolute fairness. The average Jew, unable to read the originals for himself, is, through a shortage of text-books, quite incompetent to pronounce an opinion of any worth upon the religion which has meant so much for his fathers and for the world. The average Christian DOES pronounce opinions, but as these opinions are drawn, neither from the originals nor from the few Jewish scholars who have written on these topics, they are invariably one-sided and incomplete. I believe that the silence of Jews about their own theology has been construed by many non-Jews into a proof that they really have no theology worth writing about.

The present work is a humble attempt to fill up a small portion of this lamentable gap. I am painfully conscious of how faultily this filling up has been done by me. I know full well how infinitesimally small a portion of the gap has really been filled up. But let the reader attribute these defects to the poorness of my ability. Let him not impute them to an imagined sterility of my subject. The rashness of my attempt became more and more apparent to me as the work grew under my pen. But perhaps a justification may lie in my having merely done the rough work of breaking down the fence of a field hitherto unnoticed and untrodden. Others, after me, may enter with more ease than I have been able to do. And the fruits of their labours will be far more satisfying than anything which I can ever hope to gain credit for.

It is a pleasant duty to offer my heartiest thanks to two kind friends, who in addition to correcting many errors, gave me all kinds of help and encouragement while the book was passing through the press. To Mr. Claude G. Montefiore my obligation is exceptionally heavy. Not only did he evince a generous interest in the progress of the book, but he also read through the proofs with a most painstaking diligence, writing down for my benefit a number of observations, comments, and criticisms, which, coming from a mind so overflowing with Biblical and theological learning, have proved an asset to the book, as well as an education to myself generally. To Mr. Israel Abrahams, the learned Reader in Rabbinic Literature at Cambridge University, my gratitude is due for having given me the first hint as

to the necessity and possibility of writing a work on the subject of Immanence from the particular standpoint adopted. Mr. Abrahams, although hard pressed at the time with other literary labour, also read through the proofs and jotted down from the well-spring of his original mind a wealth of notes, comments, and counsels, many of which I have incorporated either in the text or in the notes which follow each chapter.

I ought to add that part of the substance of the Introduction and of Chapters I.-VI. appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1912. It is here reprinted by kind permission of the Editor.

J. ABELSON.

July 8, 1912.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION	PAGE 1
------------------------	-----------

CHAPTER II

HOW DOES THE HEBREW BIBLE PRESENT THE SUBJECT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE AND TRANSCENDENCE?	46
---	----

CHAPTER III

SOME POST-BIBLICAL VIEWS OF DIVINE IMMANENCE (OUTSIDE RABBINIC LITERATURE)	55
---	----

CHAPTER IV

THE SHECHINAH—GENERAL VIEW	77
--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V

THE SHECHINAH AS LIGHT OR OTHER MATERIAL OBJECT	82
---	----

CHAPTER VI

SHECHINAH PERSONIFIED—(A) THE “FACE OF THE SHECHINAH”	98
---	----

CHAPTER VII

(B) GENERAL PERSONIFICATION	104
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| (C) THE PERSONIFIED SHECHINAH AS THE IMMANENT GOD IN PALESTINE, THE TEMPLE AND THE SYNAGOGUE | PAGE
117 |
|--|-------------|

CHAPTER IX

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (D) THE PERSONIFIED SHECHINAH AS THE IMMANENT GOD IN ISRAEL | 126 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER X

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| (E) THE SHECHINAH AND SIN | 135 |
|-------------------------------------|-----|

CHAPTER XI

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (F) THE SHECHINAH AND THE TORAH | 143 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XII

- | | |
|--|-----|
| (G) THE SHECHINAH AND THE WORD | 146 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER XIII

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| (H) THE MEMRA | 150 |
|-------------------------|-----|

CHAPTER XIV

- | | |
|---------------------------|------|
| THE HOLY SPIRIT | 174. |
|---------------------------|------|

CHAPTER XV

- | | |
|--|-----|
| IN WHAT RESPECTS IS THE RABBINIC TREATMENT OF HOLY SPIRIT AN ADVANCE UPON THE OLD TESTAMENT TREATMENT? | 205 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER XVI

- | | |
|---|-----|
| MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE | 212 |
|---|-----|

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER XVII

PERSONIFICATION OF HOLY SPIRIT	PAGE 224
--------------------------------	-------------

CHAPTER XVIII

HOLY SPIRIT AND PROPHECY FROM THE RABBINIC STANDPOINT (1)	238
---	-----

CHAPTER XIX

HOLY SPIRIT AND PROPHECY FROM THE RABBINIC STANDPOINT (2)	258
---	-----

CHAPTER XX

HOLY SPIRIT AS IDEAL	268
----------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXI

HOLY SPIRIT IN ITS RELATION TO NON-JEWS	275
---	-----

CHAPTER XXII

THE GENERAL RABBINIC CONCEPTION OF GOD	278
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII

RABBINIC DOCTRINES OF SIN AND EVIL FROM THE STANDPOINT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE	304
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIV

RABBINIC VIEWS OF PRAYER FROM THE STANDPOINT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE	321
---	-----

CHAPTER XXV

THE COMPATIBILITY OF MYSTICISM AND RABBINIC THEOLOGY	340
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVI

CHRONOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT

PAGE
357

APPENDIX I

ON THE INTERCHANGING OF THE TERMS "SHECHINAH" AND
"RUAH HA-KODESH" 377

APPENDIX II

ON THE CONNEXION BETWEEN "KABOD" (GLORY) AND SHECHINAH 380

INDEX 383

מי נטך יייר הנפטר מאישון
הנגולת בלב ההונצער מכל לשון
ראשון לכל ראשון
ברוך אורי יום ים

מי נטך ולא מי ארך
רבך נאכ בכל מעשה ירך
בכל עבורי ועריך
למשפטיך עמו היומ

(From the *Diván of Abú-l-Hasán Jehuda Ha-Levi*, edited for *Mekizé Nirdamim* by H. Brody. Berlin, 1911.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE present essay is an attempt at a work on the Immanence of God in Rabbinical literature. The two terms, "Immanence of God" and "Rabbinical literature," require definition. I will deal with the latter first.

People commonly understand Rabbinical literature in two senses. Firstly, the narrower sense, comprising the literary output of the Palestinian and Babylonian Academies, which commenced in or about the century preceding the rise of Christianity, and ended with the age of the last Geonim in the eleventh century—in other words, the literature familiarly known as the Mishna, Midrash, and Gemara. Secondly, the wider sense, which embraces the foregoing epoch and, in addition, the literature of the mediæval commentators and philosophers, the works of Rashi and Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, Nahmanides, Karo, Isserles, the authors of the Kabbalah, and a host of others contemporaneous with these and stretching down to about the Mendelssohnian period. This ambiguity of the term "Rabbinical" really arises from the uncertain and elastic usage of the term "Rabbi." Whereas some would understand "Rabbi" to refer to a teacher of the Talmudic or Geonic age, like R. Akiba, R. Judah the

Prince, and R. Sherira Gaon, others would claim that title equally for Rashi, Maimonides, Ibn Gebirol, Nahmanides, Abarbanel, Luria, and ever so many others of the same category. In the course of this essay I am confining myself to the narrower connotation. Had I, in my search for material about the Immanence of God, ventured into the larger field, I should have found far ampler substance. For I should then have comprehended the later Kabbalah in the scope of my investigations; and the later Kabbalah is the fullest expression of Jewish mysticism.

Yet I feel convinced that no treatment of any aspect of Talmudic mysticism—and the Immanence of God is certainly an aspect of it—can in the last resort be said to be complete which does not take within its purview that luxuriant crop of sublime lore about God and the universe which, intermixed with much that is not so worthy, is the fascinating hall-mark of the mediæval Kabbalah. For the latter is really an integral portion of Talmudism. It is part of its flesh and blood. How these mystical doctrines became incorporated in the Talmud, whether and how far they are the result of Jewish contact with non-Jewish systems of thought and belief, it is not needful here to consider. M. Franck in his book *La Kabbale* has made thorough-going investigations on this very head. Anyhow, we know that these mystical allusions are embedded in the texture of the Talmud, and it is therefore totally wrong to follow Graetz in regarding the mediæval Kabbalah as a thing *per se*, as something quite apart from its Talmudic antecedents, as an unnatural child of the darkened intellects of the Jewish middle ages. Neither is it right to judge of its merits or demerits by the rationalistic standards which Graetz and his school adopt towards it. The mediæval Kabbalah is a direct descendant of the

I Talmudic Kabbalah, and by the Talmudic Kabbalah one means all those mystic pronouncements which lie scattered and dispersed throughout the extensive realms of the Talmudic literature. These mystic pronouncements, no matter to which age they belong, are but various presentations of Jewish feeling and Jewish thinking about one and the same subject—God. The Jewish heart has in all ages panted for union with the living God even as the hart panteth after the water-streams. The Jewish soul has never ceased to find a solace, such as the mere world cannot give, in the realised joys of the nearness of God, in that mystic elation which the Psalmist doubtless experienced when he exclaimed, “My soul followeth hard after Thee: Thy right hand upholdeth me” (Ps. lxiii. 8). The Jewish mind has at all seasons and in all ages meditated upon the meaning of all this mystery; and the Kabbalistic literature of each of these successive ages is the delineation of these problems and attempts at their solution in ways which accorded best with their notions of Judaism and religion generally. But it is one and the same flowing stream emanating from one common source, although certain new elements must have been gathered up, and assimilated, in the course of its flow down the ages. You cannot cut the stream of Kabbalah into parts and say, “Here ends one part; here commences another.” Kabbalah is really the literature of Jewish mysticism from about the first pre-Christian century until almost recent times. In this scope there would be included all the mysticism dotted about the Talmudic and Gaonic literature, the French, German, and Polish Kabbalah of the Middle Ages, and the mysticism of the Hassidim.

But what is Mysticism? I have just said that the Immanence of God is an aspect or branch of Talmudic

mysticism. But before a writer can attempt to enlarge upon Immanence, he must make clear to himself and to others what he means by mysticism. And when the implications of mysticism have been laid bare, it is then, and only then, possible to realise the contents and bearings of Talmudic mysticism. Mysticism, then, might be roughly defined as that phase of thought or feeling which urges that God is a supreme, all-pervading, and all-indwelling power in which all things are one. To the mystic, God is not an external being or object merely to be worshipped or thought about or spoken to in prayer. God is an experience. The mystic embraces, experiences God, as a living presence within his own soul. Professor Edward Caird in his book *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers* (1904), says : "Mysticism is religion in its most concentrated and exclusive form ; it is that attitude of mind in which all other relations are swallowed up in the relation of the soul to God." The mystic is conscious of God as an indwelling Father in his own soul, as an indwelling spirit of goodness in the world. His aim and purpose is to know this indwelling Father, to realise this spirit of goodness, and by these means to unite himself to God in as close a bond as it is possible for any human being to effect. Professor Rufus Jones in his recent book, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, gives the following excellent definition : "Mysticism is the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense, and living stage." In fine, the mystic is he who lives religion, not merely feels it or professes it.

Covering such a wide area as it does, the name of mysticism is given to a great many differing tendencies of religious thought. Besides, mysticism on

account of its dealing with abstractions, is a branch of philosophy as well as religion. But what is of the highest importance to emphasise here is the fact that all forms of religion possess a mystical element. Speaking in the *Quarterly Review* for July 1909, the late Father Tyrrell says: "If the tone of life is to be deep and rich and not harsh and metallic it needs a strong infusion of mysticism." Now there is no known instrument that can make the tone of life deep and rich, other than the instrument of religion. For what is the acme of all religious teaching, but the fact that man is face to face with God, that he hears His voice and feels His presence, that he can only find his truest sanctification, his being's highest and holiest joy in drawing as near as he can to the love that radiates from the Presence of God. There is no religion in which the word "love," and the idea it stands for, does not occupy a commanding place. And it is mysticism that pushes love to the forefront. The mystic's ideal is communion with God. His soul reaches out in loving yearning to embrace God. And he knows that he has found God, because he has felt the thrill of His answering love. Indeed it is hard to see how any religion can resist the wear and tear of time, unless it emphasises the emotional element far and away above the intellectual. The religious man feels rather than knows. To quote Father Tyrrell again: "Every one is something of a mystic; no one is nothing but a mystic."* By "every one" he probably means every adherent to any religion, excluding the atheist. This over-towering predominance of feeling in faith is the burden of the well-known mystical lines of Tennyson:—

* This idea is echoed by Miss Evelyn Underhill in her recent book on *Mysticism* (Methuen & Co., 1911), where she says (p. 84): "No deeply religious man is without a touch of mysticism; and no mystic can be other than religious, in the psychological if not in the theological sense of the word."

If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
I heard a voice "believe no more"
And heard an ever-breaking shore
That tumbled in the godless deep ;

A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stood up and answer'd "I have felt."

Moreover, no religion can dispense with the mystical element, because no religion can disregard the great fact of the soul. Religion tells us that the soul is a spark of the Divine flame. Mysticism puts more substance into the idea, complements it, by telling us that the soul partakes of the Divine nature and finds its final consummation in merging its identity in a complete union with it. The soul, says the mystic, is ever seeking God as the complement of its life and the perfection of its form ; and man, in as far as he has a soul, partakes of the one central Divine Life. Furthermore, a strong feature of religion's teaching is the fact that in its conjunction with the body the soul is the superior partner of the two. The soul is the seat of love ; the body is the abode and instrument of sin. The soul must be stronger than the body, because, in the sight of God, love must vanquish sin. Mysticism elaborates this teaching by declaring that man's love calls out the Divine essence in response. God desires on His own part to have communion with us. He wishes to mingle His spirit with ours as a friend with a friend, or a father with a child. In fact, our communion with Him is only possible because He has, so to speak, taken the initiative, and implanted in our hearts the germs of that overflowing love which He bears to us. But in order that this communion should be complete, the bar of our lower self must be removed. There must be a total self-surrender to God on man's part, otherwise he cannot

possibly be united to God. In this way, mysticism is really reinforcing religion's universal preaching on the necessity of the suppression of sin before man can claim the title of a child of God.

Yet one further point. Mysticism may be said to express the inmost core of religion because in its insistence upon the Fatherhood of God it *ipso facto* conveys the sterling truth of the brotherhood of men. It is thus the great incentive to works of altruism, to self-sacrifice on the noblest scale. The true mystic can never be a self-centred individual. The man who is conscious of his mystic union with the spirit of God, must recognise the image of God in every fallen brother. Sympathy, love, benevolence, mutual helpfulness and encouragement must be the practical outcome whether of the individual mystic or of the community in whose fundamental beliefs and hopes mysticism is enshrined. Jews claim this prerogative for Judaism; Christians claim it for Christianity. Both sects adduce instances from their theologies as well as from their histories to prove their contentions. And the fact that of all the world's faiths, it is just these two that are the concomitants of the highest grades of civilisation and enlightenment, goes a long way towards showing the indispensableness of mysticism to religion. It is the former that makes the latter a living power.

To demonstrate, as I am attempting to do in this essay, that the theology of Talmud and Midrashim is coloured with a considerable tinge of mysticism is to vindicate for Rabbinic Judaism two claims which are made by present-day Christian thinkers for Christianity exclusively.* As a result of the investigations I have made in my own special province I feel that Judaism

* It should be said, by the way, that Buddhism is usually credited with possessing some mysticism.

may just as strongly and justifiably urge these claims as do the followers of Christ. Let us see what these claims are.

Firstly. It is maintained that a religion can only hold its ground to-day, provided its fundamental doctrines and demands are in keeping with the findings of modern empirical science. One of the most obvious tendencies of the religious thinking and writing of to-day, is that of shifting the centre of gravity of religion away from the idea of "authority" to the idea of "experience." Traditional rules and dogmatic formulæ do not extract the homage of men or hold sway over their minds and bodies in the manner or degree that they did in a former age. Obedience to tradition and dogma is becoming mingled with a conscious and unlovely scepticism. Religious facts are getting to be treated more and more after the fashion of the phenomena of science, of Astronomy and Geology, of human Physiology and Psychology. We seek *empirical* evidence of God: what we crave for is first-hand experience of the Divine Presence. We want to weigh and examine things which we ourselves know and see and feel, while accepting little which comes from any other channel, no matter how hoary it may be with the veneration of past ages. What then, on this understanding, is the final test of the rightness or wrongness, the credibility or falsity of a religious fact? It is the ability of the individual to *experience* this fact. In other words, right religion is an experience—an experience which embraces the entire personality of man and transcends all the limits of definition and explanation. We *live* religion, and not merely think it or feel it, or express it in words. And it is by taking the noblest types of men and women who have *lived* religion, and noting the records of their first-hand

experiences in this domain, that we can lay down for ourselves the surest lines on which to base our own religious conduct. In short, we derive our religious ideals not from books or formulæ, but from persons. It is just this profound tendency of modern thought that is leading people not only to lay more stress on the importance of studying the mysticism which belongs to all forms of religion, but to radically modify the estimate hitherto held of the value and nature of mysticism. To the average cultured mind, mysticism used always to be associated with something abnormal ; to be a mystic was to be a sufferer from some peculiar disease not easily understood, and hysteria was an inevitable accompaniment. That there is some amount of truth in this view can be seen from a recent work like that of Baron Von Hügel on *The Mystical Element of Religion*. His treatment of the subject is a piece of abstruse metaphysical speculation. And yet whom does he select as the person in whose life he studies all these far-reaching and profound doctrines ? It is Saint Catherine of Genoa, a woman "in whom we have to do with a highly nervous, delicately-poised, immensely-sensitive and impressionable psycho-physical organism and temperament" . . . (vol. i. p. 220). "And this temperament involved an unusually large subconscious life. All souls have some amount of this life, but many have it but slight and shallow ; she had it of a quite extraordinary degree and depth" (*ibid.* p. 221). Von Hügel's study is an able presentation of one side of the truth. That there is another side is proved in the recently published book, by Dr. Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*. The author shows in a scientific spirit, to which no one can hesitate to give his acquiescence, how there are in reality two types of mystical experience.

healthy life. The second falls into the category of pathological phenomena. "It is true," says he, "that great mystics have often possessed peculiar psychical constitutions. They have sometimes exhibited the phenomena of hysteria and sometimes they have beyond question been pathological and have experienced abnormal states due to an unstable nervous system." But yet the author finds a healthy explanation of even these abnormalities. These mystics, says he in effect, peculiar people though they unquestionably were, built up an environment for themselves, an environment which had no meaning and no value for any one else, but which had a striking life-value for themselves. The "correspondence" between them and their environing reality meant health to them, although to the outsider it appeared topsy-turvydom. We have an illustration in Biblical literature of this phenomenon. Ezekiel is the great mystic among the prophets. It is probably for this reason that he is one of the most original figures in the sacred literature of Israel; and it is probably also on account of the under-valuation and neglect of the importance of the mystical element, that Ezekiel has never been appreciated as much as he deserves, with the result that the text of the book has been transmitted in so poor and neglected a form.

Now, the distinguishing characteristic of Ezekiel is his ecstasy. Chap. iii. 26 attributes a kind of paralysis of the tongue to him. This was a physical abnormality. Other chapters abound in bits of autobiography which tell us of his mental aberration at certain points of his career when the "hand of God" was strong upon him. Now, are these statements of his pathological experiences to be taken literally? Certainly they are. Only we must judge them from Ezekiel's own standpoint and not from ours. To us

they appear as painful inflictions, dismal states of ill-health, the very thought of which makes us shudder. But they need not have been so to Ezekiel. They may have accorded well with his own version of the meaning of his environment. They may have been, and probably were, ecstasies not of sorrow but of joy, not of pain but of health. It was merely his own particular way of realising the happiness of communion with God.

It is a deeper recognition of these possible points of view from which mysticism may be looked at that is nowadays leading people more to appreciate than to deprecate it, as was hitherto the almost unbroken custom in the case of even cultured folk. And it is this same fact that is also urging a steadily increasing contingent of students to study the lives and works of the great mystics of the past—Jewish, Christian, and others.

But, to come now to my point. The apologists for Christianity to-day attempt to bring it into line with modern empirical science by showing how the wonderful power and irresistible fascination which Christ wielded over primitive Christianity were due primarily and essentially to His direct *experience* of God; and how this experience of God gradually found its way into the hearts of His followers, binding them together in a fellowship with the Divine, raising them to the level of feeling themselves the objects of a constant incoming of the Divine Life, partakers of the Holy Spirit, which filled them within and enveloped them without, and in which they lived and moved and had their being. Well, assuming that this is a correct deduction from the written records, what has Rabbinical Judaism to say for itself? Must it confess its exclusion from such an inheritance? Is it shorn of the prerogative of having enjoyed the mystical experience of union with God such

as is claimed by the first stages of Christian history? Truly enough, it has no commanding, immortalised, semi-divine personality at its head such as Christianity has! But this does not vitally affect the question. Can Judaism show that at an epoch more or less contemporaneous with Christ and the Apostolic age, its adherents also had experiences of a Divine Presence filling them and encircling them and following them whithersoever they went? If it can, then it, too, can lay claim to being a mystical religion. And it, too, can bring itself into line with the findings of modern empirical science. The object of the present essay is to push forward this claim for Judaism by illustration and argument from the Rabbinic writings; and thus to found an established place for it in the company of the scientific faiths of the world.

Secondly. There is a widespread impression that the Jewish theological thinkers and teachers of O.T. as well as N.T. times confined their horizon wholly to the transcendence of God. It was left, say they, for Pauline and Johannine Christianity, with their mystical teachings on the Holy Spirit which dwells *in* man and unites him with God, to complement and correct this one-sided view of religion; and thus, by bridging the gulf between God and man, to give the world the first complete understanding of the truest and worthiest relationship between man and his heavenly Maker. One of the pivots on which this contention rests is the Rabbinic view of angels. In post-prophetic times angelological speculation reached a very high degree of luxuriance among the Jews. The Jewish theories of the nature and function of angels, it is argued, were devised as a mechanical means for bridging the chasm between man and God, because from the O.T. standpoint God was not regarded as being in immediate contact with man, and Rabbinic Judaism

found itself forced by the necessities of its own thought to make good this deficiency, but without success. But a study of the O.T. and the Rabbinic writings has convinced me of the two following facts : (1) That the view of God taught by the O.T. is certainly not so exclusively transcendental as is generally imagined. There are a great many strong and unmistakable glimpses of the immanent view. These shall be detailed and dwelt upon in their proper place. Passages of a deistic tendency like that of Isa. xl. 22 are indeed common : "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers ; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." But why ignore the doctrine of the spirit, which although rather inchoate and indistinct, is nevertheless asserted in more than one verse of the Psalms or the Proverbs or Job ? * And one is not quite so sure that the O.T. angels are merely the intervening media between man and God, and that they cannot be made to subsist with a high conception of Deity. We must not forget, in this connection, the sacredness which to the Jewish mind, from earliest recorded times down to the present day, hedges round the Divine name. A variety of devices, circumlocutions of many sorts are invented to prevent its usage whenever possible, because usage is synonymous with irreverence. Now, some such idea as this, permeates the employment of angels in the O.T. as it undoubtedly enters into the Rabbinic usages of Shechinah and Holy Spirit, as I shall show later on. The Jew became loath to *describe* God as mixing too freely and frequently with men — and in describing anything the name must inevitably be used—but it does not follow, as a consequence, that he did not

* And in several other books of the O.T., as is fully shown in Volz's work, *Der Geist Gottes* (1910).

continue to harbour the idea and cherish the belief of God's close contact with men. But as he thought it sacrilege to put the belief into words, he was forced to fall back upon a substitute. This substitute was the angel. The train of servitors and ministrants which the O.T. designates as angels, ought rather to be looked upon as emanations of God, traces of His workings in the world of nature and of man rather than as indications of His aloofness and inaccessibility. The subject is by no means an easy one, but I feel sure there is much plausibility in this latter view. (2) Investigation has made clear to me that the O.T. doctrines of angels, its frequent references to the spirit of God, its occasional references to the Holy Spirit, and its few other stray and spasmodic hints on the Immanence of God, are the immediate forerunners, one might say, the parents of the Rabbinic doctrines of Shechinah and Holy Spirit, terms which, as will be shown in this essay, connote the Rabbinic teachings on the Immanence of God. It is for this reason that in my treatment of the Holy Spirit I have given such a large preliminary space to the O.T. teachings on the spirit. The former is a direct development of the latter and cannot be understood without reference to it. The two taken in conjunction form one complete whole. The conclusion has accordingly forced itself upon me that on the subject of Divine Immanence, Judaism has had nothing to learn from Christianity. The Rabbins evolved their own doctrines of Immanence by their studies of the O.T. and more so by their interpretations of their own life-experiences in the light of O.T. teaching. Even had Paul never lived, the Jew would still have been the heir to the belief in a Father that indwells him and indwells the universe. There is a mysticism in Rabbinical literature which is a source of perennial

strength to the religion of the Jew and a guarantee of its continuity.

The practical outcome of the current denial of the Immanent idea to Rabbinic Judaism is seen in the comparison usually drawn between the “*inwardness*” of the Christian faith and the “*outwardness*” of traditional Judaism. Even an acute thinker like Professor Henry Sidgwick, on p. 114 of his *History of Ethics*, contrasts the “righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees” with the “*inwardness*” which, says he, “is the distinctive feature of the Christian code.” The implication is, that the “righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees” was merely an external punctilioiusness in ceremonial observances of all kinds which left the heart untouched, and implied no underlying spiritual content. That this is an inaccurate account of Pharisaic Judaism has been demonstrated to the hilt by Mr. C. G. Montefiore, in the Ninth Lecture of his *Hibbert Lectures* (1892), as well as by Dr. Shechter in his *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, and others. Rabbinic Judaism certainly has a good deal of the outward yoke about it. But it lays quite as much emphasis upon, and ascribes quite as much beauty to, the necessity of the inward call. That which we of to-day regard as a yoke need not necessarily have been a yoke to the Jew of Talmudic days. We have to let the past speak for itself and not import our own sentiments into it. If it be a fact that, as Dr. Shechter laconically puts it, “To the Jew, God was at one and the same time above, beyond and within the world, its soul and its life,” then who will arise and deny the virtue of inwardness to Rabbinic Judaism? A theology which posits a far-off God, separated from man by an unfathomable distance, could never give that large scope to the doctrine of Repentance which we find in the pages of

the Rabbins. This doctrine is of itself sufficient to stamp Judaism as a religion of the heart. And if mysticism is "religion in its most acute, intense, and living stage" (Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 1909, p. xv), then must Rabbinic Judaism hold a foremost place in the category of mystical religions. For few could have realised the Presence of God more acutely, more intensely than the Rabbinic Jew, who aimed at sanctifying even the smallest details of the physical life, because he regarded nothing as being too humble to come within the purview of Him, whose glory fills the universe, and whose word is the main-stay of all.

In the present essay I have treated mainly of the aspect of Divine Immanence which the Talmudic sages envisaged under the names "Shechinah" and "Ruah-ha-Kodesh" (Holy Spirit). And in the case of the former I have been attracted to compare and contrast many a point in Jewish Hellenistic literature—particularly in Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon—with what I considered to be a parallel idea expressed by the Rabbinic Shechinah. But I have all along felt this one very great difference between the two sets of thought—a difficulty which makes me exceedingly pessimistic as to the ultimate literary value of that portion of the essay—viz. that whereas in the Hellenistic writings, the ideas relative to Immanence are couched in more or less philosophical language and conceived in a distinctively speculative vein, the Shechinah ideas (and the same applies to the Holy Spirit ideas) are of a naïve and untechnical character. They are practical sayings, with nothing of the speculative, nothing in the nature of abstraction about them. I had, accordingly, to meet the difficulty of comparing and contrasting a host of unphilosophical

expressions, with statements which are part and parcel of a set philosophy. In fact, this has been one of the trying features of my subject all along. The Rabbis were not metaphysicians, and Hebrew is a language of concrete not abstract terms. Immanence is a philosophical idea. To demonstrate therefore how, from the artless and oftentimes childlike language of the Haggadah, it is possible to infer that the Rabbins had real glimmerings of a theology known only to the trained philosophic thinker, is no light task. And yet, on further reflexion, the difficulty need not be so great after all. For, firstly, one must not forget that an element of the childlike pervades the mysticism of all lands and every age. It is discernible even in the most highly-developed and deeply-philosophical branches of mysticism. From a psychological standpoint it is only what one would expect. A phenomenon of mind in which the emotions play so predominant a part as they do in mysticism, must of necessity lead one back to the primitive springs of human thought and conduct. All other intellectuality cannot but be an after-growth and expansion of these. As Dr. Rufus Jones points out in his book to which I have previously alluded, the characteristic mystic of the Middle Ages, Meister Eckhart, is himself a remarkable example of the union of a profoundly speculative mind and a simple childlike spirit (p. 217). What the Rabbinic literature gives us is the simple childlike spirit divorced from profound speculation. And then, secondly, the basic thought of Immanence is that of the Omnipresence of God. The old-world Rabbi did not trouble himself about the problems which may arise when the doctrine is applied all round to the things of the ordinary life. But this did not make him one jot less of a believer in the validity of the doctrine; neither

does it detract aught from the value and significance of his expressed thought about it. The Immanence of God may have been to him quite as much of a reality as it was to a Plotinus although he did not, because he could not, express himself so deeply on the matter. When R. Simeon Ben Yoḥai in the Baraita (Megillah 29a) said, "Come and see how beloved are Israelites before God, for whithersoever they journeyed in their captivity the Shechinah journeyed with them," or when R. Judah, in Deut. Rabba ii. 10, declaims on the "nearness" of God because, as he says, "although the distance from earth to heaven is a 500 years' journey, yet when man whispers or even meditates a prayer, God is at hand to hear it," they were but giving expression, equally with the mystics of other ages and nations, to an instinctive conviction that there is a Divine Goodness and Power and Love active and efficient everywhere throughout the universe, and that man is at all times in union with, and in the presence of, an Infinite Spirit and Personality. There is a passage in the first chapter (*שער היזחוב*) of the *חובות הלבבות* "Heart Duties" where Bahya (a Spanish-Jewish philosopher of the eleventh century) remarks as follows :

ונאמר על קצת מן החכמים שהריה אומר בחפלו אלדי אתה אמצעך
אך אתה לא אמצעך נסורת ולא תורה והכל מוך מלא.

"It is related of a certain sage that, in the course of his prayer, he used to say as follows : 'Oh ! my God, where shall I find Thee, but verily where shall I find Thee not ? Thou art hidden and canst not be seen, but, forsooth, all things are filled with Thee.' " All this is simplicity itself, but it holds the core of the mystical idea. It is the quintessence of the doctrine of the Divine Immanence.

The idea of Immanence involves the relation between matter and spirit, body and soul. The distinction between body and soul was a fact known to the earliest ages of mankind. Even the savage had a crude conception of it. But it remained for a later and more philosophical age to recognise the true import of the antithesis between the two. As far as Jewish literature is concerned, there are to be found in the Midrash two rather crude but, nevertheless, telling attempts at portraying this antithesis. These are (1) a passage in Tanhuma Vayikra vi. as follows :⁽¹⁾ In the time to come the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring the soul and ask, "Why hast thou transgressed the precepts?" It answers, "It is the body that is the transgressor, not I. Since I left the body am I not perfectly spotless?" Then God goes to the body and says, "Why hast thou sinned?" It answers, "It is the soul that is the sinner, not I. Since the soul has left me, canst Thou find any iniquity in me?" What does the Holy One do? He brings them both together, joins them together and judges them as one. This is illustrated by the parable of the blind gardener and the lame. The latter says to the former, "I see some nice fruit in this garden. Take me on your shoulders as I cannot walk, and we shall then get the fruit and divide it between us." This was done. After a time the royal owner of the garden misses the fruit. He accuses the lame man of having eaten it. But the latter replies, "Have I legs to carry me thither?" Then he accuses the blind man. But the latter answers, "Have I eyes to see?" How does the king solve the dilemma? He places the lame upon the shoulders of the blind, and judges them as one. And so God brings the soul and deposits it in the body as it is said, "He shall call unto the heavens from above, and

to the earth that He may judge His people." "He calleth unto the heavens," this refers to the soul. "And to the earth that He may judge His people," this refers to the body. What we have here is an elementary representation from the ethical standpoint of the relation between the ideas of body and soul, matter and spirit, heaven and earth.^(1a) (2) A passage in Tanhuma Bereshith v., as follows: Hadrian asks Aquila upon what the universe rests. Aquila replies that it rests upon spirit, and as a proof he has a camel brought to him. He places a load upon its back and orders it to rise. It rises. He then orders it to sit, and it sits. Next he places on the camel a burden more than it is accustomed to carry, and also has a rope twined round its neck. Hadrian pulls one way and Aquila another, and the camel is strangled. Then Aquila says to Hadrian, "Bid the animal rise." Hadrian replied, "What! You have killed him and you ask me to bid the carcase rise!" "Yes," replies Aquila, "but what have I done? Have I really killed the beast? Do not his body and all his parts appear to be sound and in the same condition as before?" "Ah!" replies Hadrian, "but you have taken the breath out of its body." "Very well," answers Aquila, "now you see what I mean. The camel and the burden on its back were sustained simply and solely by the breath of its body. You can easily understand that what sustains the whole universe and holds together the infinite number of the elements composing it, is the breath of God."⁽²⁾ Here what we really have, is an illustration of the mystery which the ancient world attached to the idea of the soul's identity with the breath of the body. It is the view of the earlier books of the Bible. In Genesis ii. 7 God is represented as breathing into man's nostrils the breath of

life.⁽⁸⁾ Here the "Neshamah," although it has a spiritual basis as being man's endowment from the Creator, nevertheless possesses the physical significance of breath. And in Genesis ix. 4, as well as in Leviticus xvii. 11, the "Nefesh" is actually conceived of as inseparably connected, if not wholly identified with, the life-blood. The Midrash quoted above, reproduces this crude conception. And this is particularly strange, seeing that already, in some of the later books of the Bible, the higher idea of a disembodied soul having its own individuality had already taken root. For example in Proverbs xx. 27, "The spirit of man is a candle of the Lord." In Job xxxii. 8, "Verily there is a spirit in man." In Ecclesiastes xii. 7, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

From the modern standpoint the relation between matter and spirit may be viewed in different ways. These are (1) as ever-coexistent facts in experience. At first thought, the sights and sounds of the universe are entirely independent of us. Nature seems to assert her laws without waiting for our bidding. The sun rises and sets, the tides ebb and flow, the flowers bloom and fade, day and night alternate in unbroken regularity quite regardless of our wishes or prejudices. But yet this is only seemingly so, for, after all, we only know these things as facts when we bring them into relation with our consciousness. The mind has to assimilate the sense-experience given it by the outside world, and for this purpose it has to exert the forces of attention and discrimination, analysis and synthesis, comparison and analogy. The external world is worked upon and coloured by our mind or spirit, so that when we say we know or feel a thing, this is only true relatively to the mind. From this point of view, then, to speak of mind and matter or spirit and matter

as separate entities is an abstraction. They are a compact indivisible whole, issuing in what we familiarly term experience. (2) Although matter seems to be so largely the passive object of mind or spirit, subserving it and being taken up by it at every turn, and moulded and fashioned in all ways, yet mind or spirit is dependent upon matter for ever so many of its complex and subtle processes. At the bottom of spirit lies consciousness, and how would this be possible were it not for the blood which nourishes the brain, and for the food taken into the body which forms and enriches the blood?—in other words, matter. Art with all its spiritual associations, with all its sublime powers to elevate and purify the human soul, would never have been possible were it not given to the mind to portray upon the material canvas the moving panorama of the facts and the thoughts, the foibles and the virtues, the joys and the tragedies of material existence. Such an idea as Love—how is this brought about but by the instrumentality of matter? If there were no material world of sorrow and suffering, of sin and of pain, there would be no arena for the exercise of Love's invincible charms. What is character but the effect on man's spirit of his material environment? The common task, the daily round, the particular vocation of the man, the type of friend he consorts with, the books or newspaper he reads, the locality or street in which he dwells,—all these material things are the fashioning instruments from beneath whose weight character emerges. Man in this sense is a machine-made animal. The machine is matter. (3) Every discussion of the relations between spirit and matter involves a double usage of the word spirit. Firstly, the spirit of man. Secondly, the Supreme Spirit of the universe, *i.e.* God. The relations between this Supreme Spirit and the

world of nature and mankind have been the theme of poets and philosophers of all ages ; the material world was to them the visible expression of God's handiwork. The Divine footprints were discernible everywhere. Matter was instinct with a religious message. As Mrs. Browning said :—

Earth's crammed with Heaven,
And every common bush afire with God.

Aurora Leigh.

Or take Wordsworth's remark about

A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.

Lines written above Tintern Abbey.

Or, better still, take that classic passage from Wordsworth's *Excursion* where the poet describes how even as a boy, the wanderer was prepared to receive from Nature the lesson of the existence of a loving God :—

He looked—
Ocean and earth, the solid frame of earth
And ocean's liquid mass, in gladness lay
Beneath him :—Far and wide the clouds were touched,
And in their silent faces could he read
Unutterable love. Sound needed none,
Nor any voice of joy ; his spirit drank
The spectacle : sensation, soul, and form,
All melted into him ; they swallowed up
His animal being ; in them did he live,
And by them did he live ; they were his life.
In such access of mind, in such high hour
Of visitation from the living God,
Thought was not ; in enjoyment it expired.

The literature of Assyria and Babylonia, the ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead, the Vedas of India, the Neo-Platonic philosophy, all breathe these ideas of God being expressed and mirrored in the world of matter ; and the

Old Testament writers harp on the same theme constantly. "The heavens declare the glory of God ; and the firmament sheweth His handiwork."⁽⁴⁾ "Thou compassest my path, and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether."⁽⁵⁾ "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit ? or whither shall I flee from Thy Presence ? . . . The darkness and the light are both alike to Thee."⁽⁶⁾ "Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known."⁽⁷⁾ "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds."⁽⁸⁾ "The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at His reproof."⁽⁹⁾ "Lo, these are parts of His ways."⁽¹⁰⁾ "Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water. The mountains melted from before the Lord, even that Sinai from before the Lord God of Israel."⁽¹¹⁾ "The glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon ; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God."⁽¹²⁾ In Talmudic and Midrashic literature we find statements like טלמוד שאין בלא שכינה אפיקו סנה. "No place but has the Shechinah in it, not even a humble bush";⁽¹³⁾ or the naïve utterance about God in nature in the tale of Rabban Gamliel acting as host to other Rabbis at a feast in honour of his son. Gamliel offers a cup of wine to R. Eliezer, but he refuses it.⁽¹⁴⁾ He offers it to R. Joshua and he accepts it. When Eliezer remonstrates with Joshua for allowing a great man like Gamliel to wait upon him, Joshua replies that he has a precedent for this in a greater man than Gamliel, viz. Abraham, who personally attended to the wants of his guests. Whereupon Zadok,

another member of Gamliel's academy, interposes with the remark, "How long will ye lay aside the honour of the Omnipresent and engage in honouring human beings? God causes His wind to blow, vapours to ascend, brings down rain, causes the ground to sprout, and prepares a table before every one. Shall not then R. Gamliel think fit to be our host?" This seems a short and very prosaic summary of the beautiful poetry of the 104th Psalm. The allusions to God as the Light of the World are legion. For example: "How did God create light? He wrapped Himself in a white garment and caused the world to be brilliant with His light (ומביחך מאורו⁽¹⁵⁾)."

The whole universe as being a reflexion or reproduction of God's image is well given in the following:⁽¹⁶⁾

בנוהג שבעולם מלך בשר ודם צורה ביבשה אבל הקב"ה צורה
במים ואומר ישרצנו הימים ונג' מלך בשר ודם בונה פלטין משורה
דיווין בעליונים ובתתונים, טמא בחלל? אבל הקב"ה אף בחלל
עוופ יעופף . . . בשור ודם אין צורתו עcosa צורה אבל הקב"ה צורתו
עcosa צורה . . . חז אדם הוא צורתו של הקב"ה והוא עcosa
צורה . . . מלך בשר ודם מתקלים במדינה . . . אבל הקב"ה אינו
כ אלא הוא לבדו בראש עולמו והוא לבדו מתקלים בעולמו . . .

Here we have several ideas: (1) water as expressing the Divine workman's hand; (2) the birds of the air (עוופת), the natural species, expressing a similar note; (3) the world of mankind an image of the Divine; (4) the world of nature as a manifestation of God's praise and exaltedness. Another favourite idea is that of the Universe as God's throne or God's footstool, based on Isaiah lxvi. 1, "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool"; or on Isaiah vi. I shall quote several more illustrations later on. They all go to show, that in the conception alike of ancient, as of modern, thinkers the larger world of nature as well as the small inner world of man are, so to speak, strung

upon a Divine Thread, a structure built upon, and supported by, a fundament of Divinity ; in short, they are a manifestation of a universally diffused Divine Spirit.

But the relations between this Supreme Divine Spirit and the Universe and man are not a fact to be explained in a few words. Great systems of thought and belief have been built upon the differing interpretations which have been applied to this relationship. Of these systems the two most important are (1) Pantheism, (2) Deism. Pantheism takes its stand upon the premiss that God is equally present in every part of His creation. The following is the definition given by a recent writer on the subject : "So far from tolerating any doubt as to the being of God, it denies that there is anything else. For all objects of sense and thought, including individual consciousness, whether directly observed in ourselves, or inferred as existing in others, are, according to Pantheism, only facets of an infinite Unity which is 'altogether one' in a sense inapplicable to anything else. Because that Unity is not merely the aggregate of all the finite objects which we observe or infer, but is a living whole, expressing itself in infinite variety. Of that infinite variety our gleams of consciousness are infinitesimal parts, but not parts in a sense involving any real division."⁽¹⁷⁾ The crucial point in this, as in all definitions of Pantheism is the fact that it assumes one and the same level of Divine revelation in every atom of the material universe. This the Theist denies. He will not endorse the assertion that God reveals His presence equally in every one of the steps in the ladder of being. As Dr. Inge says : "We all believe in the omnipresence and immanence of the Deity, but we could not endorse the words of the Indian philosopher who said, 'The learned behold God alike in the reverend Brahmin,

in the ox and in the elephant, in the dog and in him who eateth the flesh of dogs,' nor Pope's line that God is 'as full, as perfect in a hair as heart.'" (18) The fatal error of Pantheism is the fact that it posits a God who is in the world but who is not above it. In other words, it assumes the immanence but excludes the transcendence of God. This makes it really indistinguishable from materialism.* Deism is the logical opposite of Pantheism. Whereas the latter errs in too exclusive an insistence upon the immanent aspects of Deity to the total exclusion of the transcendent aspect, the former makes quite the opposite mistake of envisaging the Deity solely from the transcendent aspect to the total exclusion of the immanent standpoint. Deism regards natural law as all-sufficient, and the perfect Deity who made the world, sits above it in perfection and isolation—an interested but passive spectator. As long as the world goes round well without a hitch, God surveys it from the heavens with complacency. Should anything go wrong, then and then only does He interfere and set the machinery all right again. It is these occa-

* "Pantheism is only a polite form of atheism. The truth of Pantheism lies in its destruction of the dualist antithesis of God and the world, in its recognition that the world exists in virtue of its own inherent forces."—Haeckel, *The Riddles of the Universe*, p. 103, R.P.A. edition. Quoted in Sir Oliver Lodge's *Life and Matter*.

Baron Von Hügel in his sketch of the spiritual character of Catherine of Genoa speaks of her faith in "the diversity, multiplicity and depth" of godliness which distinguish men. "They will necessarily, even if they all be fully faithful to their call, possess Him in indefinitely and innumerable various degrees and ways." This conviction, says he, "prevents any touch of real Pantheism or Indifferentism from defacing the breadth of her outlook" (*The Mystical Element in Religion*, i. p. 233.)

The accusation of Pantheism has been laid at the door of many a writer on mysticism, and the unbiased reader is often offered the alternative of substantiating or refuting the charge. This is well exhibited in the case of Meister Eckhart, the profoundest of all German mystics. His ideas of the distinction between "God" and the "Godhead," of the relation between the soul and the Godhead, of the nature of human and Divine personality, come very near the perilous edge of Pantheism, and it is not by any means easy to redeem him from the charge. See Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 161, also Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, chap. xii. See also chapter on Theism and Pantheism in vol. ii. of Martineau's *Study of Religion*.

sional Divine interferences in mundane affairs that were regarded by Priestley and his followers as evidences of God's interest in the world and mankind. But God's concern went not one jot beyond this.* Such was one of the main tenets of the Deism which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries found a great stronghold in England and France. For the present it is enough to say that a deistic universe in this sense does not express the views of Judaism whether from the Biblical, post-Biblical, mediæval philosophic, or modern standpoint. Here it may especially be emphasised that the transcendent view of God as preached by Deism is being more and more shattered by the teachings of modern scientific and philosophic thought generally. This thought bases itself on the great fact of intelligence, will, purpose, in nature. And it draws the irresistible conclusion that at the back of it all there must be one great unifying, Infinite Intelligence that we call God. Professor Momerie says: "If we proceed to analyse our experience and to ask what is implied in the terms knowledge and existence, we shall see that in the very possibility of experience, there is implied the unceasing activity of an infinite and eternal Personality essentially similar to our own."⁽¹⁹⁾ In other words, our knowledge of the material world—nay, even the very being of that world—is dependent on the existence of God. And again he says: "Corresponding then to the constructive activity of our own mind which enables us to know the material world as a system of relations, there must be the constructive activity of another Mind, essentially akin to our own, which produces and maintains the system of relations that we know. In other words,

* In Kimhi on Amos iii. 2 there is a curiously similar idea of God's non-interference with the nations except when some great crisis arises. Kimhi quotes a few Rabbinic parallels to this idea.

the intelligence, of which our mental constitution is the outcome and to which we owe subjectively the very possibility of knowledge, is, at the same time, objectively the source of that orderly relation amongst phenomena which alone makes them possible objects of experience. Our limited consciousness implies the existence of a consciousness that is unlimited, the life of every finite personality bears undeniable testimony to the necessary existence of an infinite Personality." Momerie is here voicing the modern scientific *immanent* character of the Deity. God is eternally present, eternally active, ceaselessly and perpetually manifested in the world around us. And, as a recent writer⁽²⁰⁾ points out, even Herbert Spencer's "Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed," to which Spencer applied the epithet of "absolute," confirms this conclusion. How can one accurately describe as absolute, an energy which underlies all things? The uphill task of modern religious thought is to demonstrate that this immanent force is a Personality, a Personal God possessed of the two outstanding attributes which we regard as inseparable from a human personality.* These are (1) Intelligence; (2) Love. Among other modern

* When employing a term like personality in this connexion we must be careful to know its exact meaning. Some people confound the idea with that of materiality, i.e. when speaking of God as a personality they imagine that it is necessary to invest Him with a tangible form. But of course the personality of God does not mean or imply a *bodily* personality. The body is not the criterion of personality at all—not of human personality either. What gives personality is life, consciousness, will, affection, the moral sense, etc. When a man possesses these, he is a personality; without them he is either a corpse or an idiot. When therefore we assign personality to God, it is on the understanding that He possesses these attributes; no idea of physical compass or dimension must or need enter. See Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, vol. i. chap. xlvi., where the author explains the anthropomorphisms of the Bible as an accommodation to the poverty of human speech. The lower senses, says he, are merely ascribed to God to show that He exists. But His personality is something far subtler, deeper and more embracing than these sensual characteristics. Cf. Martinean's remark (*A Study of Religion*, vol. ii. 2nd edit. p. 183, 1889): "As the parts of our nature which thus enter into relation with God are precisely those which make us '*Persons*' and distinguish us

writers who have set themselves to a demonstration of this truth, we may single out for mention J. R. Illingworth from the theological standpoint, and Sir Oliver Lodge from the standpoint of science. Illingworth gives an analysis of the successive stages by which, commencing with Animism, there blossomed out the full conception of Divine Personality as presented in the Old and New Testaments. His arguments for the proof of this Personality are the following : Firstly, the Cosmological argument. This is, to use his own words, "the argument derived from the belief that we recognise in the universe without us certain qualities of infinitude, reality, causation, independence and the like which have no counterpart except in the region of our own personality, and can only, therefore, be interpreted as attributes of a person."⁽²¹⁾ Secondly, the teleological argument, or argument from evidences of design in the world. The adaptations which we notice all round us in the world of nature suggest the presence of a directing, indwelling reason which is comparable only to the "continuous consciousness which co-ordinates all the functions of our being, manifesting itself in every thought or word or deed." In other words, consciousness, intelligence, design, purpose are the hall-marks of personality in man. Therefore they are the hall-marks of personality in God. Thirdly, the moral argument—the voice of conscience, the "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not" within the human breast. This cannot possibly be the invention of other men. It commands and urges and forbids, praises and blames in a way that no mere man-made law or social ordinance could do. Yet, says

from other 'living things' it is difficult to see why the same term should not be given to the corresponding attributes of rational and moral Will in Him. . . . Here it is that the God, immanent through the universe besides, and operating by determinate methods alone passes into transcendent existence . . . and establishes moral relations with beings whom He has endowed with a certain scope of similar volitional causality."

Illingworth, "with all its independence of human authorship, it has the notes of personality about it. . . . It educates our character with a nicety of influence irresistibly suggestive of paternal care. . . . And the inevitable inference must be that it is the Voice of a Personal God." *

It will at once be noticed that no endeavour is made in Illingworth, to deduce the possession of the attribute of Love in the personality of God; and unless this is done, the whole argument is really unproven. For this purpose, Christian writers generally have recourse to the Incarnation. But from a Jewish standpoint this is quite unnecessary. It can be reached by quite another road. God as Reason and God as Love are not mutually opposed. The Psalmist certainly did not think them antagonistic, or how could he have said, "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Thy throne; loving-kindness and truth shall go before Thy face"? (22) The truth seems to be that they are each and equally an aspect of the Divine Nature. God from the standpoint of reason is the Judge of the whole earth. From the standpoint of mercy He is the Father who "doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." (23) In Rabbinic phraseology the *צדקה הדין* is never dissociated from the *צדקה הרוחניתם*. Punishment was never considered by the Jew as the act of a vindictive Judge. It was a pledge of God's merciful interest in him, a sinner, urging him to abandon his evil course. God so loved him

* "But there is a *moral* presence of His Spirit to our minds, which places us in relations to Him more intimate and sacred. Surely there occur to every uncorrupted heart some stirrings of a diviner life; some consciousness obscure and transient it may be, but deep and authoritative, of a nobler calling than we have yet obeyed; a rooted dissatisfaction with self, a suspicion of some poison in the will, a helpless veneration for somewhat that is gazed at with a sigh as out of reach. It is the touch of God upon us, His heavy hand laid upon our conscience and felt by all who are not numb with the paralytic twist of sin" (*Martinean, Endeavours after the Christian Life*, chap. on "The Besetting God").

that He could say, "Return, ye wayward children; I will heal your waywardness."⁽²⁴⁾ The metaphors and similes in the Old Testament depicting God as the loving Father are too numerous to mention. The verse "Whom the Lord loveth He correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth,"⁽²⁵⁾ shows clearly enough how to the mind of this ancient writer, pain was not the punitive measure of a judge, but a discipline of love. And it is exactly in this light that Jewish teachers regard the subject to-day.⁽²⁶⁾ Suffering is the wholesome discipline inflicted on us by a God in whom love and reason are combined. Surely the assertion of the Personality of God can have no stronger corroboration than this.^(26a)

Thus the following conclusions emerge: our answer from the modern standpoint to the question, What are the relations of the Supreme Divine Spirit to the universe and man, must be, that this Spirit is a *personal* God possessed of intelligence, reason, will, purpose, and love, who is the Power behind all phenomena. He is Omnipresent. Every particle of creation reveals Him. He is eternally active. And it is by this eternal activity and eternal self-manifestation that He is directly known to us. Here we have our definition of Immanence. It is at once an answer to (a) Pantheism, which is synonymous with materialism; (b) the rationalistic Deism of the eighteenth century, which, with its too great leaning upon transcendence, placed God outside the world and deprived Him of any influence therein; (c) a good deal of modern Agnosticism, which derives many of its arguments from the professed inability to reconcile many theological teachings, as e.g. Biblical miracles, Inspiration, with the universally-accepted dogmas of modern science. God indwells His creation, He is the Infinite Power and Infinite

Love manifested in and through this finite world of things and men. This is the way in which the best modern thinking presents God.⁽²⁷⁾ This is the meaning of the phrase "Divine Immanence."

But there is something more to be said. We have searched for and found our definition of the idea of Immanence, and yet we cannot leave the matter here. There is another pressing phase of the subject with which we must make our reckoning. We must have a clear understanding of the exact relations which Immanence bears to Transcendence. The fatal blot on the teachings of the Pantheist is the fact that he denies the Transcendence of God. Does Immanence deny this Transcendence also? Or, to put it more explicitly, can any Immanent theory of the Deity be said to hold its ground while totally excluding the Transcendence theory? In answer to this query, it seems pretty certain that any Immanent theory which does not *ipso facto* involve the claims of Transcendence, is really indistinguishable from Pantheism. It is merely Pantheism masquerading under another name. As a matter of fact, there is some lack of clearness and unanimity in the modern exponents of Immanence; and that several among the latter are mere Pantheists though unconscious of it, and though they would rebut the accusation with the uttermost vehemence were it laid at their door, is to me, beyond doubt. I cite in this connexion the views of the Rev. R. J. Campbell, one of the most uncompromising among modern exponents of the Immanence doctrine. It is difficult from his writings to know where and how to draw the line of demarcation between Immanence and Pantheism. Thus, he uses expressions like "The highest of all selves, the ultimate self of the universe is God" (*New Theology*, p. 34). "The word God stands for

many things, but to present-day thought it must stand for . . . the unitary principle implied in all multiplicity" (*ibid.* p. 17). Now, a theology of this kind seems to me neither religious nor ethical. It is not religious for the following reasons :—(a) It leaves no room for the Personality of God. God, in this theory, is merely an absolute principle, merely another and grander name for the universe, apart from which, He has no existence or significance whatsoever. You cannot render religious homage to the "ultimate self of the universe." You cannot feel religious trust in a metaphysical idea. You cannot make an effort at communion with an abstraction. (b) It excludes a vital dogma like that of the Fatherhood of God, the indispensable corner-stone on which three great faiths of the world, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, rest. It leaves no room for the feeling of love or obedience towards that Infinite Power, which, as many of us believe, trusting to what we hold to be the evidence of our own souls, is ever welling out in unbounded mercy and love towards us. (c) It conflicts with the idea of Prayer. Prayer must be directed to a person. You cannot pray to a unitary principle or to a universal life. You cannot worship that which is only a higher manifestation of yourself. No such conceptions of deity will ever provoke the yearnings of the soul or satisfy its prayerful aspirations; and it is not ethical, because if God is the ultimate self of the universe, then His manifestations must be equally in the evil and the good, in the virtuous and the vicious. All men and things must equally reveal Him: the sinner as much as the saint, the honest man no more than the thief, the coward no less than the hero. All moral distinctions are annihilated.

Wherein lurks the fatal error in the presentation

of such views of Immanence? It lurks in the fact that the "indwelling" of God in man and the world—which is the meaning of Immanence—is so prone to be confounded with the *identity* of God with man and the world. Here is a dilemma from which it is not easy to escape. Many a mediæval mystic was, through this very cause, pronounced heretical and his writings condemned. Their overweighted insistence upon Immanence always laid them open to pantheistic suspicion. Much of Jewish mediæval mysticism likewise bore the brunt of unstinted abuse from staunch orthodox authorities, because in laying itself open to a pantheistic interpretation it appeared to be in flagrant contradiction to the accepted dogmas about the Jewish God.*

What, then, must be the interpretation of Immanence which, while avoiding the lurking pitfall of Pantheism, brings it into line with the root-tenets of religion? The answer can best be given by quoting the remarks of two distinguished modern writers on the subject. In his *Personal Idealism and Mysticism* (p. 45) Dean Inge, speaking of the differences between Stoicism and Alexandrian Judaism, says: "If we would avoid Pantheism, we must worship a God who is *above* as well as *in* the world." In his book on *Divine Immanence* Illingworth says: "On this analogy, then, the Divine Presence which we recognise in Nature will be the presence of a spirit, of a spirit which infinitely transcends the material order, yet sustains and indwells it the while. We cannot indeed explain the method either of the transcendence or the indwelling, but we come no nearer to an explanation by attempting . . .

* "Unless safeguarded by limiting dogmas, the theory of Immanence, taken alone, is notoriously apt to degenerate into Pantheism; and into those extravagant perversions of the doctrine of deification in which the mystic holds his transfigured self to be identical with the Indwelling God" (Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, p. 119).

to obtain simplicity by suppressing either aspect of the only analogy that we possess" (p. 40). In other and simpler words, we only do justice to the Deity when we view His existence *from the immanent and transcendent aspect combined*. It is worthy of note, by the way, that Father Tyrrell strongly maintained this standpoint when, in describing Christianity (see *Quarterly Review* for July 1909), he said it was "a religion that is institutional, mystical, and rational . . . optimistic, yet pessimistic, *transcendent yet immanent*. . ." Tyrrell might just as well have been describing Judaism here. There are two truths from which there is no escaping. These are (1) God is in man; (2) God is greater than man. Unite these two propositions in a mutually fair proportion, and you get a faith redeemed from the mists and shadows of Pantheism and materialism, you get a doctrine of Immanence which is compatible with the essence of religion. To my mind, it was just this way of regarding the Immanent doctrine, viz. as existing side by side with the transcendent conception of God—it was just this view that was given expression to by the Psalmist when he declared, "Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid Thine hand upon me"*(cxxix. 5). The first half of the verse expresses the truth of the all-encompassing nature of God, but yet with the intermingled idea of His aloofness, His distance. God is behind and before, but He is not necessarily near or accessible. The second half, "and laid Thine hand

* So the Revised Version. In this sense of besetting or besieging a town, the verb is used in Deut. xx. 12, 19; 1 Kings xx. 1; Isaiah xxix. 3. The LXX, Peshitto, and the Vulgate, however, interpret it as *formasti me*, making the root *נָסַע* = *נָסַע*. But as Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*, 1897) points out, the statements about the creation of man in this Psalm do not commence until verse 14. Besides, as he says, this idea forms part and parcel of the teaching of Divine Omnipresence which commences at verse 7, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, etc." God besets man on all sides, so that he cannot escape from His gaze.

upon me," alludes to man as a product from the hand of God, pervaded with His energy, His Spirit and His power operating within him, possessing and revealing,—just as any piece of work by the craftsman or artist must possess and reveal,—the mind, spirit, and power of the maker. It is the Immanent view.

And that just this view of Immanence, as an ever-present fact in everlasting combination with Transcendence, is the only one which consists with Rabbinic theology, can be seen from the three following considerations. *Firstly*, it is axiomatic in the Judaism of the Rabbins that God is the Creator of the universe. Now creation, view it from whatever standpoint you like, must of necessity imply a far-reaching difference between Creator and creature. It stands to reason that the Creator of the universe must *transcend* the universe. And yet, as it is the object of these pages to show, God's Shechinah walks and fills the world, it fills Synagogue, Temple, and Holy Land. It is an ever-constant protector, counsellor, and friend. God's Holy Spirit is resident in the heart of the Torah student and of the man of saintly works and pure thoughts. It speaks from beneath the pages of Holy Writ and is man's unseen inspirer to the worthiest and the best. Thus Immanence and Transcendence coalesce into one another, component parts of the same whole. *Secondly*, the variegated host of expressions which I have attempted to piece together as denoting Rabbinical views on the Immanence of God all have one common feature, viz. that they characterise the complete aversion to creating an *identity* between man and God. There is a phrase in Rabbinical theology which speaks of *מדמה צורה ליזראה*, "comparing the form to the Former." This may be described as the *terminus ad quem* to which the Rabbins went in this province —*comparing* but not identifying. The Shechinah

abides with Israel. The Holy Spirit inspires the saints and prophets. But it is always *God's* spirit, *God's* Shechinah. Investigation has convinced me that ever so many passages speaking of Shechinah and Holy Spirit in a highly personified sense, can be paralleled in different parts of the Talmud and Midrash, by passages of exactly the same import, but which speak of God's "Shechinah," "God's Holy Spirit." What does this prove, but that to the old Rabbinic mind there was always a very real glimmering that however all-pervading and all-embracing God may be in an immanental sense, He is yet marked off from the world by some not easily discernible line of separation? He is after all *God*, not *Man*; He transcends man and is immeasurably greater than man's little world. And likewise with the Rabbinical views of God's fatherhood and God's nearness. There is an obtruding element of the transcendent idea in them all. To say that the bond which links man to God is analogous to that subsisting between parent and child, is to create the closest possible tie between the Deity and the world. And yet it is nothing more than a case of resemblance. A child resembles its parent but is not identical with it. A long chain of events separates the one from the other. And yet again, on the other hand, it is just the realised sense of the Fatherhood of God which is one of the basic factors that constitute man's experience and conviction of the Immanence of God. The Jew believed that God was at one and the same time, above, beyond, and within the world:

Closer to him than breathing, nearer than hands and feet,
simply because he believed in God as a father. In this way, again, do immanence and transcendence complement one another. Apart, they supply no

working creed. *Thirdly*, Prayer occupies a place of unique importance in the Rabbinic theology. As if to emphasise this importance to the highest pitch imaginable, the Rabbins picturesquely say that God Himself actually prays. But prayer is only possible when the Deity is comprehended under the double aspect of the transcendent and the immanent. It is futile to pray to a merely transcendent God because He is too far removed to hear or interfere. To the Pantheist, prayer is an absurdity. You must, perforce, pray to a person, you cannot pray to the universe or the totality of being. Besides, from the Rabbinic standpoint, praying to the Deity and praising the Deity are on a par. They are warp and woof of one texture. A glance at the traditional liturgy of the synagogue confirms this assertion. As much space is taken up with the laudation and glorification of the Deity, as with supplication and petition to Him. And it is almost as illogical to praise and exalt an impersonality as it is to pray to it. That the portrait of an immanent God never appeared complete to the minds of the old Talmudic masters unless it contained a sensible admixture of the element of transcendence, is seen from the remark in Deut. Rabba ii. 10, to which I have previously alluded, viz. that although the distance from earth to heaven is immeasurable, yet so marvellous is the efficacy of prayer, that even when it is whispered, even when it is inwardly meditated without outward expression whatsoever, God is at hand to hear it. Here we have the doctrine of Immanence, God's proximity to man, nay, God's indwelling in man, because how otherwise could He know of the prayer before it is on the suppliant's lips? And yet a touch of extreme transcendence is imported by the statement that God is *in the heavens*, which are separated from the earth by an

unfathomable span. But all this was an honest, outspoken summing up of the truth as they perceived and felt it.

In fine, a course of clear thinking on the problem makes it evident, that the only safe way for the mystic to prevent himself falling into Pantheism, lies in a linking-up of these two inseparable phases of the Godhead. There is a most strange resemblance on this very head between a Midrashic passage and a passage from one of the sermons of Eckhart. The former is in Genesis Rabba iv. 4, and commences, "מְאֵר וּמָר אֶת ר' נֹתַר אַחֲד שָׁאֵל אֶת ר'" "A certain Cuthæan once asked R. Meir." He asked him if it were possible that God, of whom it is said that He fills heaven and earth (Jer. xxiii. 24), could speak to Moses from such a narrow compass as that between the two staves of the ark (Numbers vii. 89)? "Take a large mirror," says the Rabbi—"when you look at yourself in it you appear large. But take a small one and then you appear small. If a human being can change himself like this at his own bidding, how much more so can God! When He wills it, He can fill heaven and earth; and when He wills it, He can compress Himself into the smallest conceivable space." Here we have a picture of Transcendence and Immanence in a working unison. God transcending heaven and earth; but God at the same time localising Himself into the tiniest spot. Eckhart builds likewise on the simile of a mirror. He says: "I take a vessel of water, put a mirror in it and place it in the sunlight. The sun sends out its light without losing any of its substance, and the reflexion of the mirror sends back sunlight. Sun and reflexion are the same thing. So it is with God. God with His own nature, His essence, His Godhead is in the soul, and yet He is *not* the soul (*i.e.* He is infinitely more than the soul. The soul sends back a divine reflexion to God so that they both are the same light)." This is

quoted from Eckhart in Dr. Rufus Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion*, p. 231. What these two extracts have in common is the idea of the greater and the less, such as Immanence and Transcendence can be seen to imply, when put, as here, into pictorial representation. Imagine a large sphere and somewhere within it a smaller sphere. The smaller is not inseparable from the larger; the larger includes the smaller and a great deal besides. The smaller is what it is by reason of its being an integral portion of the larger. "God is the place of the world, but the world is not His place," is the Rabbinic paradox which closely matches the sentiment of Eckhart. To gain the correct perspective of the Deity, one has no alternative but to view Him from this combined dual standpoint.

When therefore, in the following pages, I make the attempt at showing that the Immanence of God was an element in the Rabbinic conception of Him, it is on the assumption that Transcendence is always a co-factor with Immanence. Rabbinic Judaism is often flouted for its weakness and insubstantiality, because of its insistence upon Transcendence to the utter neglect of Immanence. It is to demonstrate that Immanence has not been neglected by those teachers, but that it is a considerable feature of their doctrines, that this book has been written.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

- (1) There is a longer and more elaborate form of this parable in Leviticus Rabba iv. 5 : tacked on to it, is another parable of a priest who has two wives, one a *נָזְרָה* and the other a *בָּרָאָה*. Trouble arises over the eating of some "Terumah," which, of course, would be permitted the former, but forbidden to the latter. The ensuing quarrel between the two women illustrates, says this Midrash, the feud between soul and body at the time of the Judgment. But eventually it is the soul that is arraigned before the bar of justice, and the body is let off

scot-free. This shows a higher grade of Rabbinic thought than the passage from the Tanhuma. In T. B. Sanhedrin 91a there is a shorter form again, which belongs to the memorable debates between Antoninus and Rabbi Judah, the Prince. The former seems to challenge the Rabbinic conception of punishment after death, by alleging that it is very easy for both body and soul to exculpate themselves. Rabbi Judah's answer gives the right relationship between the two, by the parable of the blind man and the lame.

(1a) Baron Von Hügel in his great treatise, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. ii. pp. 122-123, points out, how in the New Testament theology about body and soul, whereas the Synoptists nowhere declare the body to be an evil, "an inevitable prison-house or a natural antagonist to the spirit," St. Paul does draw a strong line of demarcation between body and soul to the great depreciation of the former, as when he declares, "Unhappy man that I am! who can liberate me from this body of death?" (Rom. vii. 24); or, "In my flesh dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18). That St. Paul drew the idea, as Von Hügel says, from the Wisdom of Solomon ix. 15, "For a corruptible body weigheth down the soul, and the earthly frame lieth heavy on a mind that is full of cares," is quite probable; but can it not also be taken as an indication of St. Paul's indebtedness to Rabbinism? Besides, as the writer whom we are quoting says further, "This attitude . . . represents only a passing feeling; for if we pressed it home we could hardly reconcile it with his doctrine as to the reality and nature of the body's resurrection." The preponderating Rabbinical view is that of the body's resurrection, i.e. body and soul conjoined in one organism. See T. B. Sanhedrin 90b, "If a grain of wheat put into the ground just as it is, spring up in manifold vesture, how much more may we expect the pious, who were buried in their garments, to return again clothed as they were?" Later Jewish thinkers realised the incongruities and crudities involved in this teaching, and made attempts to spiritualise the idea of Resurrection. Thus, Maimonides identified it with the immortality of the soul (see his Introduction to Sanhedrin x.), and although he composed his famous treatise on the Resurrection, this was merely done in order to silence the venom of the then champions of extreme orthodoxy, who complained that he had practically ignored this great subject in his *Moreh*. He obviously regarded the old Rabbinic views of bodily resurrection as of minor importance.

(2) The relations between Aquila and the Emperor Hadrian are a pet theme of the Haggadic narratives. Until recently it was only possible to get an idea of Aquila's Greek translation of Scripture from the scattered fragments of Origen's *Hexaplar*. But in 1897, F. T. Burkitt in examining the mass of Dr. Schechter's Geniza treasures, came across some fragmentary MSS. of Aquila's original translation (and published them entitled, *Fragments of the Books of Kings, according to the Translation of Aquila*, Cambridge, 1897). Legend has busied itself with accounts of Aquila's conversion to Judaism. See Tanhuma on ~~Leviticus~~ v.; Genesis Rabba xxx. 12; T. B. Abodah Zarah 11a. In T. B. Gittin 56b allusion is made to a certain Onkelos, apparently Onkelos of Targum

fame, who was בֶּן אָחִיךְ רַמְּטָם, the son of Titus's sister. Aquila is always alluded to as the son of Hadrian's sister. Seeing the looseness with which the Rabbinical literature often handles the names of Roman and Greek monarchs and places, some authorities are inclined to regard the name Onkelos as another form of Akilas or Aquila, and Titus as a mistake for Hadrian. Others, however, maintain that Onkelos and Aquila were two different persons who lived at different times. (See especially Friedmann's *Onkelos and Akilas*, *passim*.)

(3) The distinction in Biblical, as well as Rabbinical, literature between Ruah, Nefesh, and Neshamah is exceedingly difficult to fathom. Of course, an equal degree of difficulty surrounds the vernacular usage of such ideas as "Soul," "Body," and "Spirit." As an illustration of the difficulty let me quote from *The New Theology*, by Rev. R. J. Campbell. On p. 34 he thus defines the terms: "The body is the thought-form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane. The soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence, and even from God; it is the bay seeing itself as the bay and not as the ocean. The spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed; it is the deathless Divine within us." The distinctions here drawn are certainly ingenious and smack of modernity. But they are merely Mr. Campbell's own arbitrary assumptions, and those who will reject them may possibly outnumber those who will accept them. What is there to prevent another preacher from manufacturing another set of definitions and distinctions? As for the Hebrew terms, a distinction is sometimes drawn by saying that Ruah denotes the more elementary primitive idea of "breath," whereas the other two refer to the more advanced conception of spirit or soul, as active in the body and intimately associated with it. But this is upset by the Ruah in Ecclesiastes xii. 7 (cp. Job xxxii. 8), where the usage is anything but primitive. And similarly in Ezra i. 5, where God "raises up the Ruah of Ezra" to build the Temple. It has here a developed religious and ethical import (cp. also Psalm li. 12; Ezekiel xviii. 31, xxxvi. 26, etc.). Again, in Proverbs xx. 27, Neshamah has a spiritual significance (as also in Isaiah lvii. 16), whereas in Isaiah ii. 22, xlvi. 5, and ever so many more passages throughout Holy Writ, it has the primitive meaning of physical breath. Again, the word Nefesh, although commonly translated "Soul," and regarded by the average reader of the Bible unacquainted with Hebrew, as alluding to the spiritual side of man's nature, is very often a mere synonym for life or body. In Talmudic literature there is also, as I have said, no clear-cut distinction between these terms; but noteworthy is the preferential usage of Neshamah to signify the soul in its truly spiritual sense. Prof. Marti in his commentary on Isaiah liii. 12 shows from the phrase נֶשֶׁמֶת מֵבָד מִנְיָן וְאַתָּה (where מִנְיָן lit. = pouring out) the close connexion of Nefesh with the blood, i.e. the physical, bodily side of man; in Isaiah xlvi. 5, where Neshamah and Ruah occur in one and the same verse, Marti says that they both mean "breath," "den Lebens-odam der den Menschen bei der Erschaffung von Gott eingehaucht wurde." Ibn Ezra connects Neshamah with Shamaïm, "Heaven," and regards Nefesh and

Ruah as the outward manifestations of the purely spiritual and invisible Neshamah. There is an interesting quotation of Ibn Ezra's view in the נסמה חיים of Manasseh ben Israel (part ii. chap. iv.).

- (4) Psalm xix. 1.
- (5) Psalm cxxxix. 3.
- (6) Psalm cxxxix. 7-12.
- (7) Psalm lxxvii. 19.
- (8) Job xxvi. 7.
- (9) Job xxvi. 11.
- (10) Job xxvi. 14.
- (11) Judges v. 4-5.
- (12) Isaiah xxxv. 2.

(13) Exodus Rabba ii. 5. . . . It is the answer given by R. Joshua, son of Korha, to a heathen, who had asked him why God chose such a place as a bush out of which to speak to Moses. In Numbers Rabba xii. 4 it is Rabban Gamliel who is asked the question.

(14) Sifri to Deuteronomy 38. T. B. Kiddushin 32b. See also Mechilta *rnn*"^a.

- (15) Yalkut on Psalm civ.

(16) Genesis Rabba vii. 1. Tanhuma on יְמִן. Yalkut on Psalm lxxxvi.

(17) J. Allanson Picton on *Pantheism: its Story and Significance* (1905), p. 10. But see pp. 309-340 in vol. ii. of Von Hügel's *Mystical Element of Religion*.

(18) Inge, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism* (Paddock Lectures, 1906), in the chapter on "Sources and Growth of the Logos-Christology."

- (19) Momerie, *Belief in God*, in chapter on "The Infinite Personality."

- (20) J. Warschauer in *The New Evangel*, pp. 49-55.

- (21) Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, Lecture IV.

- (22) Psalm lxxxix. 15.

- (23) Lamentations of Jeremiah iii. 33.

- (24) Jeremiah iii. 22.

- (25) Proverbs iii. 12.

(26) A favourite Rabbinic saying showing that pain and suffering are the disciplinary aspects of a God of Love is that which runs: "God never smites Israel until He has created the remedy for the wound beforehand." In other words, healing is one of the preordained remedies of God. It is from this point of view that Rabbinical literature views two other important teachings of Judaism, viz. Repentance and Prayer. Thus it is said in T. B. Pesahim 54a that "Repentance was called into existence even before the world was created." Suffering and misfortune are the inevitable results of man's sins, but man is not necessarily pinned down for ever to the cruelties of a harsh retribution. The possibility of a brighter lot was decreed for him by the Creator even before the creation of the heavens and the earth. If man exercises "Teshubah," i.e. Repentance, which implies that he betters his attitude towards God, then God's attitude towards man becomes changed for the better. This is the preordained plan of God, and is a clear illustration of what not only the old teachers in Israel, but some of the best modern Jewish theologians,

understand by a God of Love. And the same train of thought applies to Prayer. T. B. Rosh Hashana 16a remarks "וְאֵרֶב כִּי הַפָּסָר." "Prayer avails a man both before and after the signing of the Divine decree." It is one of God's preordained plans, that the genuine prayer of even the most hardened sinner should restore him to the Divine Grace. This is only possible, under the conception of God as the highest embodiment of what we mean by Love.

(26a) The difficulties clustering round the problem of personality, whether from the psychological, or theological standpoint, are many and great. As Dr. Frank Ballard says in his dissertation on *The True God* (R. Culley, 1907): "It is frankly acknowledged by psychology that no satisfactory definition, no adequate conception of human personality is forthcoming. What constitutes individuality in all its fulness, no man living can say. . . . It would then be sheer irrationality to attempt for the divine that which is not possible for the human. To confess bewilderment as to the apprehension of the finite, and then demand comprehension of the infinite, is the very extreme of self contradiction."

(27) In his little volume entitled *The Substance of Faith*, on p. 89, Sir Oliver Lodge remarks: "The Christian idea of God is not that of a being outside the universe, above its struggles and advances, looking on and taking no part in the process. . . . It is also that of a God who loves, who fears, who suffers, who keenly laments the rebellious and misguided activity of the free agents brought into being by Himself as part of Himself, who enters into the storm and conflict and is subject to conditions as the Soul of it all." Had Sir Oliver Lodge ventured to give this as the Jewish view of God, he could not have stated it more correctly. The idea of God keenly lamenting "the rebellious and misguided activity of the free agents brought into being by Himself as part of Himself," gave rise to the poetic imagery which is scattered throughout the Talmud and Midrash in the form of parables about a king and his only son (or only daughter). Prosaically, the subject is treated from various standpoints in the several Midrashim which deal with the cosmogony of Genesis or the ethics of the old Jewish sacrificial system of Leviticus.

CHAPTER II

HOW DOES THE HEBREW BIBLE PRESENT THE SUBJECT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE AND TRANSCENDENCE?

RABBINIC literature is more than an appendage to the Hebrew Bible. It is a commentary on it. Hence the investigator into any department of Rabbinic thought must, perforce, have recourse to the original, viz. the Hebrew Bible. It wants little knowledge of Old Testament lore to know that the view of God which was uppermost in the minds of its inspired writers was Transcendent, not Immanent. God's dwelling is far removed from the haunts of man, high above in the highest heavens, unapproachable, shrouded in a secrecy that no mortal gaze can penetrate. One very early instance of this is perhaps to be found in Genesis xxxii. 30, where Jacob asks the name of the mysterious "man" who wrestled with him until the breaking of the day; and the pregnant reply given is, "Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name?" A mysterious secrecy hedged round the names of angels as well as the Divine Name in the Bible. This is frankly admitted in Judges xiii. 18, where the angel replies to the inquiring Manoah, "Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret?" This is certainly a hint at God's unknowable nature. We have it again in Exodus iii. 14, "And God said unto Moses: I Am that I Am, and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am

hath sent me unto you." The "Name" of God is frequently used in the Bible as an equivalent for God. Thus Exodus iii. 15, "This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial for all generations"; Exodus ix. 16, "And that my name may be declared throughout all the earth"; Psalm cxxxv. 13, "Thy name, O Lord, endureth for ever; and Thy memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations" can only be satisfactorily explained in this sense. God's distance from man gives the Psalmist many a theme for metaphor and simile. Take Psalm ii. for example. Its dominating idea is that of a huge concourse of men at one spot, from the most distant parts, in order to ventilate their grievances against one, who is the author of their troubles, and whose views are diametrically opposed to theirs. It is God who is their butt. Yet, is He in the same plight as a human master would be under such trying circumstances? Certainly not! He is quite outside the reach of His opponents' mischief. "He that sitteth in the heavens laugheth; the Lord holdeth them in derision." His distance, His unfathomable distance, guarantees His absolute immunity. Isaiah in xl. 22 makes use of a similar metaphor to illustrate another idea. He says, "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." The Divine Being is here a magnified man. How effective is the language of Isaiah iv. 8, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." We have here three ideas. God is far. God is incomparable. God is unknowable. And all these ideas are again

reproduced in the Book of Job. "God is great and we know Him not" (xxxvi. 26). "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than sheol; what canst thou know?" (xi. 7, 8). "Behold, I go forward, but He is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him: on the left hand, where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him: He hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see Him" (xxiii. 8, 9). This distant isolation of God is even used, by Elihu, to illustrate to Job God's immunity from the effects of man's wickedness or goodness. "Look unto the heavens, and see; and behold the clouds, which are higher than thou. If thou sinnest, what doest thou against Him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto Him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him? or what receiveth He of thine hand?" (xxxv. 5-7). Even so late a writer as the author of Ecclesiastes said (v. 2), "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few." This seems an echo of the naïve transcendent view of the Deity enthroned as a king, immeasurably higher than any mortal can aspire to, and before whom men must walk with bated breath.*

But yet the Bible is not without its indications of the contrary view. Not that one will expect to find in

* In chap. viii. of his *Hibbert Lectures* (1892), Mr. C. G. Montefiore alludes to this passage of Ecclesiastes as one which is often quoted to show how in Judaism's view the transcendence of Deity meant His total separation from men and nature. Mr. Montefiore combats this view by showing how in the post-exilic Judaism the idea of "Heaven" was gradually becoming emptied of its purely *local* signification. We to-day speak of "God in heaven," but this is not prejudicial to the idea of the nearness of God. Heaven is merely part of one of God's titles ("Our Father in Heaven"), and the most convinced upholder of the Immanent view finds nothing antagonistic or repugnant in its usage. In Ben Sira vii. 14 this passage in Ecclesiastes is taken simply as a warning against redundancy in prayer.

the Bible any sentence or phrase which presents the Immanence of God in any philosophical sense, or with any of the implications of modern scientific thought. The Bible teaches no philosophy. It is not a text-book of science. What one can find there is a few indications of Immanence from the simple standpoint of Omnipresence. One turns in the first instance to the magnificent lines of Psalm cxxxix.* “Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy face? If I climb up into heaven, Thou art there; or make Hades my bed, lo! thou art there! If I lift up the wings of the dawn, and settle at the farther end of the sea, even there Thy hand shall lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me.”⁽¹⁾ All this seems many stages of thought in advance of the sentiments from the Psalms which we have previously quoted. So do the following quotations from Deuteronomy: “For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee; therefore shall thy camp be holy that He see no unclean thing in thee and turn away from thee” (Deut. xxiii. 14).† “For this commandment . . . is not hidden from thee,

* In his recent book, *Der Geist Gottes* (Tübingen, 1910), Professor Paul Volz (on page 146) characterises this 139th Psalm as “der Lied der göttlichen Allgegenwart und Allwissenheit, in dem monotheistische Geschlossenheit und pantheistische Stimmung besonders schön vereinigt sind.” He goes on to say that in the conception of the author of the Psalm, the Spirit of God is a cosmic power . . . akin to the idea of “the face of God” which characterises the self-revelation of God in the cosmos. Volz’s next remarks are important. He says: “sie erinnert in ihrem Wesen und Wirken an die ältere Vorstellung vom übersinnlichen, den Kosmos durchwallenden Ruh-element (Ezech. Gen. 1, 2), ist aber hier monotheistisch mit Jahwe verknüpft und bekommt dadurch eine innerliche sittliche Färbung; sie ist zugleich eine Art beobachtendes, die Ordnung hüttendes Organ. . . . Ruh ist an und für sich das Pantheistische, Alldurchwaltende, aber sie ist Ruh Jahwes. Die Allgegenwart Jahwes wird durch die Ruh zwar nicht verbürgt. . . .” In short, Volz wishes to make it clear —what I shall all along endeavour to make clear—that the usages of Spirit, Shechinah, etc., as hypostases are consistent with the strictest monotheistic conception of God. Op. Briggs (*International Critical Commentary*) on this 139th Psalm.

† Reading through the proofs, Mr. C. G. Montefiore makes the following adverse comment here: “It is *not* the case that the historic order of develop-

neither is it far off. It is not in heaven. Neither is it beyond the sea. . . . But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it" (Deut. xxx. 11-14).

There is a powerful reproduction of these ideas in a passage of the second Isaiah, as follows: "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (lvii. 15). This is a very apt commingling of the two aspects of God. He is aloof and unapproachable; but yet He is near, in the very recesses of man's heart. This idea seems to be further spiritualised in the remark of Elihu (Job xxxii. 8): "Verily there is a Spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." The usage of Ruah as the Divine Spirit within man is very rarely met with in the O.T. It reminds one of the Ruah Ha-Kodesh or Shechinah of Rabbinic literature and of Wisdom in the Apocrypha. Elihu uses it as his excuse for interposing in the debate of men older in years than he. It is not years, says he, that are man's prerogative and give him his right to speak. Man's distinguishing mark is his possession of the Spirit within. Hence flows his wisdom, his authority, and his sense of justice. Professor Karl Marti in his commentary on Isaiah lxiii. 9, 10, thinks that the phrase יְהוָה רֹאשׁ in verse 10, "His Holy Spirit," implies the later or Rabbinic and Apocryphal significance of the Holy Spirit.⁽²⁾

ment was as you maintain (1) God far off, (2) God near. As a matter of fact, Yahweh was very near in old days. He moved away from Sinai and lived with Israel, in clouds and pillars, in the ark, etc. The quotation from Deut. xxiii. 14 does not specially represent advanced thought. It is quite antique. God became far off rather *late*, and then by Immanence He had to be made 'near'

Closely associated with our subject, although not an integral part of it, is the constantly-recurring Biblical representation of God as the Father—in the first place as the Father of Israel. But the idea can be consistently extended to include the whole of mankind. The Fatherhood of God is certainly an aspect of His Omnipresence ; it is an incontestable proof of His nearness. It would be futile to give here all the Biblical instances of God as Father. They can be gathered from any Concordance. I will only quote a few characteristic examples : “Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitith them that fear Him.”⁽³⁾ “But now, O Lord, Thou art our Father ; we are the clay and Thou our Potter ; and we all are the work of Thy hand.”⁽⁴⁾ “For I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born.”⁽⁵⁾ “Have we not all one Father ? Hath not one God created us ?”⁽⁶⁾ Conversely some characteristic examples can be quoted of the usage of “son” in relation to the Father. “Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my first-born son.”⁽⁷⁾ “He shall build a house for my name ; and he shall be my son and I will be his Father.”⁽⁸⁾ “Is Ephraim my dear son ? Is he a pleasant child ? For since I spake against him I do earnestly remember him still.”⁽⁹⁾ “I will say to the North, Give up ; and to the South, Keep not back : bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth.”⁽¹⁰⁾

To summarise. The Hebrew Bible presents God at times under the Transcendent, and at times under the Immanent, aspect. The elements making up the Transcendent aspect are (i.) God’s Name as being unknowable ; (ii.) the idea of secrecy surrounding God, as mentioned frequently in Biblical books ; (iii.) God’s Throne in the heavens at a great distance from man ; (iv.) God as magnified human king enwrapped in isolation ; (v.) God as Creator of heaven, earth, and all their hosts, having

made which, His activity has ceased. On the contrary, the elements which point to His Immanence, so far as the Hebrew Bible is concerned, are (i.) His Omnipresence ; (ii.) the nearness of His "Word";⁽¹¹⁾ (iii.) His unique nature of being able to dwell with the humble and contrite, while at the same time having His abode in the lofty heavens ; (iv.) His Spirit, as being the producer of man's wisdom and holiness ; (v.) His Fatherhood, which involves an amount of interposition in human affairs.

The transcendent view is paramount. But the indications of the other view amount to something more than a negligible quantity. It may be asked, Can we give the name of Immanence to such expressions? If we confine the term to its stringent modern application to the Deity as "indwelling" His creation, and as being manifested both to the mind and eye in every element of animate and inanimate creation, then it is difficult to see how the Biblical phraseology brings this out. But if we give a wider and looser connotation to "Immanence,"—and this is admissible if only on the grounds that the Bible is no metaphysical or theological treatise,—we can at any rate assert, that there is an indication of this doctrine within the pages of the Old Testament. After all, what better summing up of the Psalmist's thoughts can be given, than to say that the one aim and end of his being was to live in the constant realised presence of God? "I have set the Lord before me constantly" was no mere rhetorical flourish. The Psalmist felt it as a truth. "All my bones shall say, O Lord who is like unto Thee?" An outburst such as this would be impossible did not the author feel that God the Father, the Protector, the source of all Love and Compassion, had spread His tabernacle, so to speak, in the very inmost recesses of his being, lifting him

up to ever higher and higher peaks of goodness and usefulness. And a declaration like "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament telleth the work of His hands" is a clear testimony to God's evident manifestation in the world of nature.* These, and the other illustrations which have been given before, are a sufficient guarantee that although the Transcendent view of the Deity predominates in it, the Hebrew Bible is no stranger to some of the most general conceptions which underlie the doctrine of the Immanence of God.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

(1) Of Psalm cxxxix. Ibn Ezra says: "This Psalm is very glorious ; in these five Books there is none like it." In his *Bible for Home Reading*, vol. ii. p. 164, Mr. C. G. Montefiore quotes the comments of the "Four Friends" as follows : "No human pen or tongue has ever expressed more vividly or profoundly the idea of the omnipresence of God. In all places, in all time, man is beset and encompassed by God, in Him we live and move and have our being ; our every thought is guided ; our every thought controlled"

(2) The only other passages in the O.T. where the phrase "Holy Spirit" occurs are in Isaiah lxiii. 11, "Where is He that put His Holy Spirit within them ?" and in Psalm li. 11, "Cast me not away from Thy presence ; and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me." Prof. Marti parallels these with the passage in Acts vii. 51, "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit" ; and in Ephesians iv. 30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." In these instances, says he, the Holy Spirit "ist hier als ein selbständiges Wesen, als eine Art Hypostase gedacht." In fact he shows how, in this chapter the peculiar phrase, מַנְצֵחָה פְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, "and the angel of His presence saved them" (which translation he utterly rejects) points to the later usage of "angel" and "face of God" as expressing the personal presence of God in the world.

(3) Psalm ciii. 13.

(4) Isaiah lxiv. 7.

(5) Jeremiah xxxi. 9.

* "If indeed," says Mr. C. G. Montefiore (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1892) "the Psalter, that monument of post-exilic piety from Ezra to the Maccabees, taught a distant God, eighteen centuries of Christian piety would not have been able to use it as a medium of religious edification" (p. 428).

(6) Malachi ii. 10.

(7) Exodus iv. 22.

(8) 1 Chronicles xxii. 9.

(9) Jeremiah xxxi. 19.

(10) Isaiah xlivi. 6.

(11) In his *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, p. 39, Dr. Inge seems to take it too much for granted that the "Word" of the O.T. is identical with the Memra of the Targum. As a matter of fact, the Memra applies to ever so many more ideas, and is found in the Targum in places where the text of the Bible makes no mention whatsoever of the "Word."

CHAPTER III

SOME POST-BIBLICAL VIEWS OF DIVINE IMMANENCE (OUTSIDE RABBINIC LITERATURE)

THE Biblical idea of God's relation to the world and man underwent considerable modifications at the hands of the Greek-Jewish philosophers who sought to blend Judaism with Hellenism. These modifications are mostly apparent in books of the Alexandrian Apocrypha, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, the Letter of Aristeas, and the fragments of Aristobulus.⁽¹⁾ But most of all in Philo, who, in his exposition of the Old Testament, introduces philosophical ideas which belong partly to Jewish thought and are partly appropriated from Hellenic philosophy. Ueberweg, in his *History of Philosophy* (vol. i. p. 223), enumerates the "traits common to the speculations of the Jewish-Greek philosophers and the Neo-Pythagoreans, the later Platonists and Neo-Platonists." The particular trait which concerns the present subject is "the theory of intermediate potencies or beings through whom God acts upon the world of phenomena." The question had begun to force itself upon these thinkers, How is it that God, though enthroned on high and removed far from the terrestrial sphere, still shows traces of Himself as working in the world? And they answered it by assuming an all-active, all-penetrating spirit or principle in the universe, holding all its parts in order and symmetry,

and showing itself in man as conscience. It is at once God and not God. That is to say, while being a manifestation or reflexion of the Deity, it is not the Deity Himself. And again, although it is something other than the Deity, it is not an independent Personality. It is, if we may use the expression, an extension of God.

Thus in the Letter of Aristeas, as Ueberweg points out, a distinction is made between the power or government of God, which is in all places (*διὰ πάντων ἐστίν, πάντα τόπον πληροῖ*), and God Himself the greatest of Beings, the Lord over all things, who stands in need of nothing and is enthroned in the heavens. Aristobulus in his Orphic poems speaks of the Biblical writings as being inspired by the Spirit of God. The world is acted on by the Power of God although He is invisible, and His throne in heaven has no contact with earth. But when we come to the Wisdom of Solomon and the writings of Philo we have far more substantial material to work upon. In the Wisdom of Solomon the step from the Transcendent to the Immanent view of the Deity can be seen under the following aspects:—

(a) The usage of the Stoic doctrine of the Divine “Pneuma” which pervades all parts of the universe and is the ever-active principle of life. For example, “For wisdom is more mobile than any motion; yea, she pervadeth and penetrateth all things by reason of her pureness.”⁽²⁾

For she is a breath of the power of God,
And a clear effluence of the Glory of the Almighty,

For she is an effulgence from everlasting light
And an unspotted mirror of the Working of God.” *

* Chapter xxiv. of Ben Sira has similar allusions to the Immanence of Wisdom. But there is this difference, viz. that whereas in this passage of the Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom is represented as in some measure an active agent in the creation of the world, in Ben Sira the idea is more localised. Wisdom,

One notices a strong parallelism between several ideas here and those to be found in Rabbinic literature. For instance, the idea of wisdom as an “effluence of the Glory of the Almighty” might be paralleled over and over again by the common expression בָּהֲרֵת הַמְשֻׁרָה “בָּהֲרֵת הַמְשֻׁרָה,” which is usually rendered as “God causing His Shechinah to dwell,” but literally rendered should be “God unloosening His Shechinah, *i.e.* setting it free” (the Aramaic “shârâ” = to unloosen, let go free). The word “effluence” = “flowing out,” and implies the idea of “setting free.” The close association of “Kabod,” “Glory,” with “Shechinah” is of common occurrence. In the Greek they are both often indiscriminately translated by δόξα.⁽³⁾ In Luke ii. 9, the words “the glory of the Lord shone round about them” are rendered by δόξα Κυρίου . . . (cp. Ephesians i. 6, δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, also 2 Corinthians iv. 6). In Targum Jonathan on Exodus xxxiii. 22, we get the two words used dependently upon one another, וְזַרְבֵּעַ בְּמַעְבֵּד יִקְרֵב שְׁכִינָתִי, “when there passes the glory (יקר = Aramaic for Hebrew כבוד) of my Shechinah.” This is like the passage quoted above from Wisdom. The idea of wisdom as “light” resembles the frequent metaphorical usage of Shechinah as light. Cp. for example Aboth De Rabbi Nathan ii. 10, והארץ האורה מנברדו אלו פנוי שכינה, The face of the Shechinah lights up the whole earth. In Numbers Rabba ii. 5, “May God cause His face to shine upon thee, *i.e.* may He give unto thee of the light of the Shechinah.” Even the idea of wisdom as “pervading and penetrating all things,” although it is unquestionably not a Jewish, but the Stoic conception of the “Pneuma,” can yet be

after having “Come out of the mouth of the Most High,” and after having “walked in the bottom of the deep,” sought and found rest only in Israel. It “took root in an honourable people, even in the portion of the Lord’s inheritance.” Ben Sira is of course Palestinian, whereas the Wisdom of Solomon is Alexandrian. This sufficiently accounts for the difference in the two views.

almost paralleled by the following Rabbinic statement from T. B. Haggigah 12a : "By means of the light which God created on the first day man may look from one end of the universe to the other." Light here is probably identical with Shechinah, as can be seen from the continuation of this passage.⁽⁴⁾ There is an all-pervading "Shechinah" as well as an all-pervading "Pneuma."⁽⁵⁾

(b) The usage of Wisdom sometimes as identical with Deity, and sometimes as an aspect of, extension of, or created thing subject to, Deity. In vii. 7 we read, "I called upon God and there came to me a spirit of wisdom." Here wisdom is the object, a gift of God to man. But in x. 1 we read, "Wisdom guarded to the end the first-formed father of the world. . . . And gave him strength to get dominion over all things." Here wisdom seems an equivalent for God. It is a personality. All this bears striking resemblance to Rabbinic modes of thought which will be considered later. We shall see how oftentimes the Shechinah is spoken of as "God's Shechinah," *i.e.* a property of Deity, and how, on the other hand, it is frequently used as an independent spiritual entity. An example of the latter usage is a phrase like "receiving the face of the Shechinah." And the same is the case with the Rabbinic usage of the Holy Spirit. The expression in T. B. Sotah 11a, "רוּחַ קָדוֹשׁ מִבְּרָתָן וְנִ" (Exodus i. 12), is a personification of the "Ruah." On the other hand, in T. B. Megillah 12b, the remark is made of Esther, that "she clothed herself with the Holy Spirit," where Ruah is meant to be the Spirit of God immanent in the world, so that man can, as it were, snatch a portion of it and enwrap himself in it.

(c) Wisdom is the immanent protector and redeemer

of mankind. It is man's anchorage in time of trouble. The whole of chapter x. of the Wisdom of Solomon is taken up with this theme, ending with the remark, "Because Wisdom opened the mouth of the dumb; and made the tongues of babes to speak clearly." All this corresponds closely to the Rabbinic usage of the immanent Shechinah. Thus in T. B. Megillah 29a (and elsewhere very frequently) it is said: "Whithersoever Israel was banished the Shechinah followed him." In T. B. Sabbath 12b we read: "How do we know that the Shechinah supports the sick? Because it is said (Psalm xli. 4), 'The Lord shall support him upon a bed of sickness.'" (In other passages the reading is to the effect that the Shechinah is "above the head" of the sick person.) In T. B. Sotah 30b there is a passage to the following effect, "At the hour of Israel's ascent from the Red Sea the people commenced their song. How was the singing done? The infant nursed upon the knees of its mother, together with the suckling babe, no sooner beheld the Shechinah (כִּיְן שָׁרָא אֹת הַשְׁכִינָה) than they raised themselves up, exclaiming, 'This is my God and I will glorify Him.' . . ." There seems the closest possible resemblance between the passage quoted from Wisdom and this passage from the Talmud.

(d) The difficulty of reconciling the immanent Wisdom with the fact of the existence of sin. Thus "Wisdom will not enter into a soul that deviseth evil, nor dwell in a body that is held in pledge by sin" (i. 4). "Therefore can nothing defiled find entrance into her" (vii. 25). But these seem contradicted by the statement in xv. 2, "For even if we sin we are Thine." One meets the same difficulty in Rabbinic literature. Thus in T. B. Sotah 3b there is the following passage: "R. Hisda said that before Israel sinned the Shechinah

abode with every individual Israelite, as it is said (*Deut. xxiii. 14*), ‘For the Lord Thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp.’ But when Israel sinned it departed, as it is said (*ibid.*), ‘that He see no unclean thing in thee and turn away from thee.’”⁽⁶⁾ On the contrary we are told (*T. B. Rosh Hashanah 17b*) : “I am the Lord before man sins, I am He after man sins.” (Based on the repetition of the Tetragrammaton in *Exodus xxxiv. 6.*) These two quotations seem to exactly parallel those from Wisdom.

(e) It has been frequently pointed out by Jewish students of the Apocrypha that Wisdom at times shows an un-Jewish proximity to being a Personality. The most salient passage is *xviii. 14-16* :—

For while peaceful silence enwrapped all things
And night in her own swiftness was in mid-course,
Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of the Royal
Throne,
A stern warrior into the midst of the doomed land,
Bearing as a sharp sword thine unfeigned commandment ;
And standing it filled all things with death ;
And while it touched the heaven it trode upon the earth.

The “Word,” that “leaps out from heaven” like a warrior with a sharp sword reaching up from earth to heaven, certainly comes very near deification. But the same sort of expression can be found in Rabbinic literature, in spite of the fact that the Rabbins made the unalloyed unity of the Deity the corner-stone of their teaching, and were never tired of insisting upon the duty of avoiding any semblance of שְׁתִּים וּשְׁתִּיּוֹת (“two divinities”) in their interpretations of Scripture. Does not the Shechinah walk and talk? Several instances will be given later on of dialogues between the Shechinah and man.⁽⁷⁾ And similarly with the Holy Spirit. And further, these very ideas in Wisdom seem a poetic rendering of several Midrashic passages on the revelation

at Sinai. The "Word" is the "Voice" at Sinai. In Exodus Rabba xxviii. and xxix. the "Voice" is strongly personified. It deals death to Israel as well as to the idolaters. God is the Warrior in whose train are myriads of angels. The Voice fills earth and heaven. It is split up into all the tongues of the globe, and conveys an intelligible message to all classes irrespective of age or sex. The "Word" again appears frequently, with personified attributes, as the דיבור ("Dibbur") or מאמר ("Ma'amar"), the latter being the Talmudic equivalent for the Targumic Memra.

Coming now to Philo, it is by no means easy to say what were his most habitual views in reference to God's relationship to the universe and man. The matter is complicated by the singular fact of Philo's twofold education and sympathies. His education was Greek. His genius was Oriental. He loved Greek wisdom, and he loved the Hebrew faith as well. He was a pious Jew. Philo gives us a Greek skeleton, and clothes it with a blend of Greek and Hebrew flesh. He was too devoted a lover of Jewish thought to give the Old Testament any disparagement in his writings, but he presses it into a framework of philosophy which is essentially Greek. And the allegorising process enables him to give the appearance of unity and consistency to his expositions of Scriptural doctrine.⁽⁸⁾ Philo's views of God are to be found scattered throughout the whole of his writings. On the question of the transcendental or immanent conception of God he is not always consistent.^(8a) He sometimes leans to the one view and sometimes to the other.* As a true disciple of Plato

* "Quand Philon parle de la création et des premiers principes des êtres, de Dieu et de ses rapports avec l'univers, il a évidemment deux doctrines qu'aucun effort de logique ne pourra jamais mettre d'accord. L'une est simplement le dualisme de Platon, tel qu'il est enseigné dans le *Timée*; l'autre nous fait penser à la fois à Plotin et à la Kabbale" (Franck, *La Kabbale*, p. 221).

he thinks of God as existing neither in time nor space.⁽⁸⁾ He cannot be conceived by man. He is self-sufficient, and has no relations with any other being. These ideas of God's transcendence and His preclusion from any activity in the world are to be met frequently in Philo. Thus: "But God has given nothing to Himself, for He has no need of anything; but He has given the world to the world, and its parts He has bestowed on themselves and on one another, and also on the universe. . . . He merely has regard to His own everlasting goodness, thinking the doing good to be a line of conduct suitable to His own happy and blessed Nature. So that if any one were to ask me what was the cause of the Creation of the world, having learnt from Moses, I should answer, that the goodness of the living God, being the most important of His graces, is in itself the cause."⁽⁹⁾ How strangely irreconcilable does this philosophic isolation of God sound by the side of a passage like the following on the Providence of God. "The fifth lesson that Moses teaches us is, that God exerts His Providence for the benefit of the world. For it follows of necessity that the Creator must always care for that which He has created, just as parents do also care for their children. And he who has learnt this, not more by hearing it than by his own understanding, and has impressed on his own soul these marvellous facts which are the subject of so much contention, namely, that God has a Being and Existence . . . and that He exercises a continual care for that which He has created, will live a happy and blessed life stamped with the doctrines of piety and holiness."⁽¹⁰⁾ Philo was too devoted a Jew to forget or ignore the distinctively Jewish doctrine of God's fatherhood—a fact which the Jew gathered theoretically from his Bible, and realised practically in the

fortunes of his own and his people's life. With such strong Jewish attachments, one must expect that Philo could not be content with the conception of the transcendent isolation of the Creator; that he could only find satisfaction in the belief that God is near and that He and His Goodness fill the universe. Philo speaks of an Immanent God in a great many passages. His idea of Immanence is probably the result of Stoic influence;⁽¹¹⁾ but it may also have been brought about by his studies of the Palestinian Midrash. Philo was influenced by Palestinian exegesis in two ways.⁽¹²⁾ Firstly, he paid more than one visit to Jerusalem,⁽¹³⁾ the home of the Palestinian teachers of the Law. Secondly, the persecutions of Hyrcanus⁽¹⁴⁾ caused some of the Palestinian Rabbins to flee for safety to Alexandria, and in this way Palestinian teaching probably became known in Alexandria before the time of Philo.⁽¹⁵⁾ Philo has much to say about the ceaseless workings of God in the world, one of the underlying conceptions of Divine Immanence. Commenting on the phrase in Genesis "And God finished His work on the seventh day," he says, "God never ceases from making something or other. But as it is the property of fire to burn, and of snow to chill, so also it is the property of God to be creating. And much more so, as He Himself is to all other beings the Author of their working. . . . For He makes things to rest which appear to be producing others, but which in reality do not effect anything. But He Himself never ceases from creating."⁽¹⁶⁾ There is a strong parallel to this idea in Genesis Rabba xi. : מ מלאנה טולמו שבת ולא שבח לא ממלאנה הrushim ולא ממלאנה האדיקום אלא פעול עם אלו עם אלו "God ceased from the creation of His world, but He ceased not from creating good and bad men. His activity with these is ever-constant." The Midrash limits God's endless

labour to the creation of the variegated characters of man. Philo widens the idea to embrace everything. [It would require investigation in order to fix the exact date of the above Midrash. One could then know whether Philo drew upon it, or *vice versa*. Or, of course, it is possible to assume that they are both independent of one another, and that Philo is merely echoing a piece of his Stoic doctrine.*] We shall consider some more instances. In the midst of a curious interpretation of the word אֵין in Genesis iii. 9 he remarks, “For since you have thought that God was walking in the Garden, and was surrounded by it, learn now that in this you are mistaken, and hear from God who knows all things, that most true statement that God is not in any one place. For He is not surrounded by anything, but He does Himself surround everything.”⁽¹⁷⁾ A duplicate passage is the following: “For let not such impiety ever occupy our thoughts as for us to suppose that God cultivates the land and plants paradises, since if we were to do so, we should be presently raising the question of why He does so; for it could not be that He might provide Himself with pleasant places of recreation and pastime or with amusement. Let not such fabulous nonsense ever enter our minds. For even the whole world would not be a worthy place or habitation for God, since He is a place to Himself, and He Himself is full of Himself, and He Himself is sufficient for Himself, filling up and surrounding everything else which is deficient in any respect, or deserted, or empty. But He Himself is surrounded by nothing else, as being Himself one and the Universe.”⁽¹⁸⁾ All such passages

* I see, on further reference, that the author of this statement is “R. Phinehas in the name of R. Hoshiaiah.” The latter’s dates are roughly about A.D. 200, so that he comes long after Philo. Prof. Bacher, in *J.Q.R.* iii. 357, attempts to show how Hoshiaiah from his familiarity with Origen may have imbibed many of Philo’s ideas. It is obvious from the tone of several of his Haggadic utterances that Hoshiaiah had a knowledge of philosophy.

are like elaborations of the great Rabbinic dictum on Immanence: *זהו מקומו של עולם' והוא עולם מקומו*, “God is the place of the world, and the world is not His place.” The next passage strongly reminds one of the Immanent teaching of the 139th Psalm. “Can a man then or any other created animal hide himself from God? Where can he do so? Where can he hide himself from that Being who pervades all places, whose look reaches to the very boundaries of the world, who fills the whole universe, of whom not even the smallest portion of existing things is deficient?”⁽¹⁹⁾ Another and more important department of Philo’s views on Divine Immanence is his theory of the Logos. Yet he seems to make the Logos mean different things at different times. One can therefore give no concise definition of it, unless it means the immanent Reason of God in the world and man. Philo taught that God’s presence is manifested in every man. “Every man in regard of his intellect is connected with Divine Reason, being an impression or a fragment or a ray of that Blessed Nature.”⁽²⁰⁾ Again, “Let every one on whom the Love of God has showered good things, pray to God that he may have as a dweller within him the Ruler of all things, who will raise this small house, the mind, to a great height above the earth, and will connect it with the bounds of heaven.”⁽²¹⁾ And again, “For when he uses the expression, ‘He breathed into his face the Breath of Life,’ he means nothing else than the Divine Spirit proceeding from that happy and blessed Nature sent to take up its habitation here on earth for the advantage of our race, in order that, even if man is mortal according to that portion of him which is visible, he may at all events be immortal according to that portion which is invisible.”⁽²²⁾ Just as Philo speaks of God as dwelling in man and the universe, so he speaks of the Logos as being inherent

in man and all things. Take e.g. his very beautiful interpretation of Psalm lxi. 10, "The course of the river makes glad the City of God." "What city? For the Holy City which exists at present, in which also the Holy Temple is established, is at a great distance from any sea or river, so that it is clear that the writer here means figuratively to speak of some other city than the visible City of God. For in good truth, the continual stream of the Divine Logos, being borne on incessantly with rapidity and regularity, is diffused universally over everything, giving joy to all. And in one sense he calls the world the City of God, as having received the Whole Cup of the Divine draught. . . . But in another sense he applies the title to the soul of the wise man in which God is said also to walk as if in a City, 'For' says God, 'I will walk in you, and I will be your God in you' (Leviticus xxvi. 12)."⁽²³⁾ In this sublime passage the Logos and God are interchangeable terms, and the implication seems to be that we are in God as well as God is in us. The Logos is used in so many senses. It is the Mind of God, the Wisdom of God, the Glory of God, the Agent of God in the creation of the world. "For it is the Divine Logos which divided and distributed everything in nature."⁽²⁴⁾ "For the Logos of the living God, being the bond of everything, as has been said before, holds all things together, and binds all the parts and prevents them from being loosened or separated."⁽²⁵⁾ The Logos is the Image of God. "For even if we are not yet suitable to be called the sons of God, still we may deserve to be called the children of His eternal image, of His most sacred Logos; for the image of God is His most ancient Logos."⁽²⁶⁾ And more important than all the foregoing for the student of Rabbinic literature is Philo's use of the Logos in what is very largely the

Biblical and Rabbinic sense of פָּאֵל angel. There is a plurality of Logoi (and not only one Logos), just as in the Bible the angels are the numerous bands of God's agents, who do His behests and speak to man; and just as in the Talmud and Midrashim (largely through the influence of Babylonian and Persian angelologies) the angels are the personified working forces of the Deity in the life of the world and man. Thus, the Logoi help man to virtue and righteousness. "For God, not condescending to come down to the external senses, sends His own Logoi or angels for the sake of giving assistance to those who love virtue. But they attend like physicians to the diseases of the soul . . . offering sacred recommendations like sacred laws, and inviting men to practise the duties inculcated by them. . . ." (27) When Hagar flees to the desert she is met by "the angel, that is the Logos of God," and being recommended what to do, she is guided by the Logos in her return to her mistress's house.⁽²⁸⁾ The Logoi seem to be the assistants of God in the making of man. Philo, in attributing Divine Immanence to man in general, fell into the difficulty of not being able to reconcile this fact with the existence of evil in man.⁽²⁹⁾ If the Divine presence had a place in every man's heart, then the evil which bad men do must be God's work just as well as the good. To overcome this difficulty, Philo assigned the cause of man's creation to his ministers—the Logoi. "The expression 'Let us make' indicate a plurality of makers. Here the Father is conversing with his own powers (*i.e.* his Logoi or ministers) to whom he has assigned the task of making the mortal part of our soul. . . . He thought it necessary to assign the origin of evil to other workmen than himself—but to retain the generation of good for himself alone."⁽³⁰⁾ To the student of Rabbinical literature

Philo's views on these and other kindred points come as no surprise. They are to be found constantly in the Midrashim. Whether Philo is the debtor to the latter or *vice versa* is a moot point. As Freudenthal⁽³¹⁾ has pointed out, the coincidence of ideas in both literatures need not necessarily stamp either as the borrower from the other. They may have arisen independently in Palestine and Alexandria respectively. Philo's view of the Logoi as angels, *i.e.* as certain "powers" of God sent down to earth to minister to man and help him to virtue, is strikingly similar to the Rabbinic conception. The field of the latter is so extensive and variegated, that it is difficult to fix upon any representative quotations. It would need a whole essay to itself. Philo's attempt to withdraw God from contact with evil by making the Logoi largely instrumental in the creation of man is elaborated in interesting ways in Genesis Rabba viii. 3, 4. The plural form "Let us make man" is there justified in several ways. One authority says that man's creation was the result of a consultation between God and heaven and earth. Another, that it was the result of a similar consultation between God and His already created work of the preceding five days. Another gives the consultation as between God and His own Heart. Then follow some significant parables. "It may be likened unto a king unto whom his architect erected a palace. He looked at it, but it pleased him not. With whom should he be angry? Should it not be with the architect?" Again, "It may be likened unto a king whose traffic was done by means of his agent. But when the king lost his money with whom should he be angry? Should it not be with the agent?" The aim of these parables is to shift the blame for the evil in man away from the shoulders of the Creator just

as is done by Philo. Philo holds the Logoi, who are God's ministers, responsible. The one Midrash gives the responsibility to heaven and earth which, according to the Biblical as well as Rabbinical teaching, are the messengers of God. The other Midrash, which gives the responsibility to God's Heart, seems to be introduced merely for the purpose of tallying with the quotation "And He was grieved in His heart." I do not see how the heart of God can by any logic be regarded as anything outside Him. But further on there is the explicit statement, *בשעה שבא לבראת אדם הראשון נמלך במלacci השורה*, "When God was about to create the first man He took counsel with the ministering angels." This leaves no doubt. A more philosophical Midrash (which is repeated in Yalkut on the words *ע"כ לא יקרו רשותם במשפט*, Psalm i.) represents God as associating Himself with the *חרחותם* "מ," "the attribute of mercy," in His creation of man. If God knew that the way of the wicked would perish, why did He create the wicked? ⁽³²⁾ And the reply is that the creation of the latter is only the result of God's association with the *חרחותם* "מ." The Rabbinic usage of "מ" and "מ" *צדין* had much in common with Philo's Logoi. Like the latter, it helps man and pleads for him in the hour of his perplexity or when punishment threatens.

Yet one other aspect of Philo's views on the Immanence of God from the standpoint with which we are here concerned, is his usage of the Logos as intercessor between man and the Deity. The Logos is at times described as the High Priest ⁽³³⁾ because, like him, it is the expiator of sins. In another place it is described as *ἰκέτης* (suppliant). "And this same Logos is continually a suppliant to the immortal God on behalf of the mortal race which is exposed to affliction and misery; and is also the ambassador, sent by the Ruler of all to

the subject race.”⁽⁸⁴⁾ And again as *παράκλητος* (Paraclete). “For it was indispensable that the man who was consecrated to the Father of the world should have as a paraclete, His Son, the Being most perfect in virtue to procure forgiveness of sins, and a supply of unlimited blessings.”⁽⁸⁵⁾ In all these, the Logos is a very strong hypostasis of the Deity. The idea was largely taken up by Christianity and worked out in the Fourth Gospel.⁽⁸⁶⁾ It went too near impugning the strict monotheism of Judaism to be taken up and seriously cherished by Jews.* And yet, one comes across Rabbinic utterances which have a striking resemblance to Philo’s words; and even though, as was said before, this does not necessarily prove borrowing or imitation; it at any rate shows that Philo’s hypostasisation of the Logos is a method of exposition not unknown to the Talmud and Midrashim. Thus, in numerous instances, the

* And yet, as if to emphasise the truth of monotheism and counterbalance any possible suggestion that these “Middot” are independent entities, we have the famous passage in T. B. Berachoth 7a, where the question is asked, “What does God’s prayer consist of?” And the answer is that it consists of the words, “May it be the will from before me that my compassion overcome my wrath, that my mercies be rolled upon my attributes (רָחֵלְךָ רַחֲמֶנְךָ בְּכָל־כְּרוּתֶךָ) and that I may show myself towards my children with the attribute of mercy. . . .” This passage is often described by Christian critics of Rabbinism as grotesque. But that this is an undeserved criticism is readily seen by any one who realises that it is one of the oft-repeated and emphatic safeguards of the Jewish monotheistic idea. The “Middah” is not God. And God is not the “Middah,” but a loving father whose one all-absorbing aim is to have cause to exercise His love. The “Middah” may degenerate into being a philosophical principle like the Logos of Philo. But a God who is a loving father is the highest phase of that personal God, which is the basis of Rabbinic theology.

Another clear illustration of the Rabbinic safeguarding against any infringement of the Unity, is afforded by the Targum on Psalm lvi. 11. Here the two Hebrew words for God (“Elohim” and the “Tetragrammaton”) occur in two independent phrases in one and the same sentence, as the utterance of one and the same man. The Targumic author evidently suspected the danger of a possible dualistic interpretation. To avert this, he accordingly paraphrases the first word for God by לְפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה וְאֱלֹהֶיךָ, “by the attribute of justice which belongs to God,” and the second word for God by “בְּכָרֶת וְחִנָּן יְהוָה, i.e. “by the attribute of mercy which belongs to God.”

For parallels between these ideas and those of Philo, see the chapter on “Die Hypostasen-Spekulation,” in Bousset’s *Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*.

ם"הַחֲנִינָה ("Attribute of mercy") is represented as a personality, speaking, pleading before God for an erring individual, or for a whole nation that has sinned. In the Targum on Lamentations i. 1, the מ"הַדְּבָרָה ("Attribute of justice") pleads (cp. Targum on Koheleth x. 8). One of the important functions of angels is to intercede for the sinner or the sick. And the Holy Spirit so very frequently plays the rôle of the paraclete. There is a very fine passage in the Song of Songs Rabba (viii. 12) where this is well illustrated. It is as follows : "When the Israelites eat and drink, and bless and praise God, He listens to them and derives satisfaction. But when the nations of heathendom eat and drink, and blaspheme God, and provoke Him to anger by their immoral talk, then God thinks of destroying the whole of creation. Thereupon there enters the Torah and speaking in defence of Israel it says, 'Sovereign of the universe, instead of looking at these who blaspheme and provoke thee to indignation, look at thy people Israel, who praise and bless and adore thy great Name by the Torah, and with Psalms and Hymns.' After the Torah there enters the Holy Spirit and says, 'Flee away, O my beloved God, flee from the heathens and attach thyself to Israel only.'" Here both the Torah and the Holy Spirit are strongly personified. Another passage in which personification is still more striking is in the Sifri on דברים, וו'את דברך, page 148 (Friedmann's edition), and it represents a chorus singing the praises of the Deity. The singers are the Holy Spirit and Israel. "Israel says, 'There is none like the God of Jeshurun';⁽³⁷⁾ and the Holy Spirit says, 'The God of Jeshurun.' Israel says, 'Who is like unto thee among the Gods?' and the Holy Spirit says, 'Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee?' Israel says, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one';

and the Holy Spirit says, ‘And who is like thy people, Israel, one nation in the earth?’ Israel says, ‘As the apple among the trees of the forest’; and the Holy Spirit replies, ‘As the rose among thorns.’ Israel says, ‘This is my God, and I will glorify Him’; and the Holy Spirit says, ‘This people which I have formed unto me.’ Israel says, ‘For thou art the glory of their strength’; and the Holy Spirit says, ‘Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I shall be glorified.’ In this characteristic passage the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, the great encourager *par excellence*. It lays before God the claims of Israel to be considered as the people nearest Him. It is an intercessor in a very similar sense to that of the Logos. This branch of the subject will be further considered in dealing with the conception of the Holy Spirit in Rabbinic literature.

One of the reasons why Philo exerted a greater influence on Christianity than on Judaism, was the fact that his doctrine of God collided somewhat with Judaism’s stringent notions of the Unity of God. But there is another, and perhaps greater, reason. Philo’s God is too impersonal; He is too much of a metaphysical entity. Philo does not teach religion, but theology—theology with all its speculativeness, with all its aloofness from the tasks of the everyday world. The immanent God of Philo is a philosophical principle. The immanent God of Judaism is a person. At the basis of the Jewish hearts’ longing and panting after God, was the unshaken consciousness that He is a father with a father’s compassion for His children. No other theory of faith would suit the Jew. Here is the supreme line of cleavage between Rabbinism and Philonism. It is just this warm, personal note that will be observed, now that the

reader passes on to consider how the Immanence of God is taught in the pages of Rabbinical literature.*

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

(1) In the books of the Palestinian Apocrypha such as Ben Sira, Baruch, Tobit, etc., there is very little development of the Biblical view of God which, as pointed out, leans mostly to the side of transcendentalism. Ben Sira's desire to keep to the beaten track of the old Biblical theology and not venture into pastures new, may possibly be hinted at in his lines :

Seek not things that are too hard for thee,
And search not out things that are above thy strength ;
The things that have been commanded thee, think thereupon,
For thou hast no need of the things that are secret.

(iii. 21, 22).

That Ben Sira was a true Palestinian in this respect, is seen from the fact that the above-quoted lines form one of the few extracts from Ben Sira to be found quoted in the Palestinian Talmud (see Talmud Jerusalem Haggigah II.). It is also found in Genesis Rabba viii. 2, this Midrash being also an early Palestinian product.

(2) Wisdom of Solomon vii. 24-26.

(3) Nahmanides in his commentary on Genesis xlvi. 4 has a long dissertation on the meanings of Kabod and Shechinah in refutation of Maimonides' view (*Guide of the Perplexed*, i. 27) that Shechinah is בְּכָךְ נִצְחָה, "a created Divine Glory." To Nahmanides the two terms were absolutely identical, both meaning Divine Immanence or the immediate Divine Presence.

(4) The continuation of the passage is, "When God looked at the generation of the Deluge and that of the dispersion (נָבָלָה גַּגְּדָה) and saw how perverse their works were, He hid the Light from them. For whose sake did He hide it ? For the sake of the good men in the time to come . . . etc." It is quite clear that Light here has the full spiritual connotation of Shechinah, especially as the Talmud so frequently speaks of the Shechinah as abiding only in the company of the pious and as departing no sooner evil enters into existence.

(5) In Wisdom of Solomon vii. 29, 30 and viii. 1 there is a repetition of the same theme showing the same parallelism with Rabbinic ideas, significantly enough, in the anecdote (mentioned in T. B. Sanhedrin 39a) where Gamliel is asked by a heathen, "How many shechinah are there ?"

* On this passage, Mr. Israel Abrahams writes to me thus : "Does not Philo again and again compare God to a father ? You quoted some passages above, and there are many others. I do not think your study of Philo has been deep enough. Especially here, you are quite wrong. Philo is full of warmth. And as for the figure of father and children, it is often found in Philo."

Gamliel's answer is, "As the sun which is one of the myriad servants of God giveth light to all the world, so in a much greater degree does the Shechinah." No better way of illustrating what Shechinah is, commends itself to the mind of the sage, than that of using the metaphor of light. And we get the same thing in T. B. Hullin 60a, when R. Joshua ben Hananya replies to Hadrian who had expressed a wish to see the Jewish God : "If thou art not able to look upon (the sun) a servant of God, how much less mayest thou gaze upon the Shechinah."

(6) A more categorical assertion is the following in Genesis Rabba iii. 6 : "God never conjoins His name with evil, but only with good." The Name is probably here used identically with Deity as in Exodus iii. 15, ix. 16 ; Psalm cxxxv. 13, etc.

(7) In Exodus Rabba xviii. 5 the angels Michael and Samael hold a court with the Shechinah as Judge. In T. B. Haggigah 16b, Berachoth 43b, the sinner is represented as "crowding out the feet of the Shechinah." And numerous other passages which I shall instance as we go along.

(8) A good typical example of Philo's blending of Greek and Hebrew ideas in his Biblical exegesis is his comparison of the four rivers mentioned in Genesis ii. 11-14 to the four Virtues, viz. Prudence, Temperance, Courage, and Justice (Vol. I. "Allegories of the Sacred Laws," xix.-xxii.). It is interesting to place this by the side of his remarks on the burning bush (Exodus iii. 2-6) : "For the burning bush was the symbol of the oppressed people and the burning fire was the symbol of the oppressors, and the circumstance of the burning bush not being consumed was an emblem of the fact that the people thus oppressed would not be destroyed by those who were attacking them . . . The Angel again was an emblem of the Providence of God . . ." (Vol. III. "Life of Moses," xii.). Philo here exactly reproduces the Rabbinic trend of ideas.

(8a) Philo's inconsistency as well as his indebtedness to Plato is well expressed by Von Hügel (*Mystical Element of Religion*, ii. p. 69) thus : "Already Philo had, under Platonic influence, believed in an Ideal man, a Heavenly Man ; had identified him with the Logos, the word or Wisdom of God ; and had held him to be in some way ethereal and luminous, never arriving at either a definitely personal or a simply impersonal conception of this at one time intermediate Being, at another time this supreme attribute of God." From a Jewish standpoint, one can assert that it is just this absence of clear doctrines about God that accounts for the comparatively scant influence which Philonic thought had on the Rabbinical schools.

(8b) Plato finds no place for a personal God in his scheme of philosophy ; Platonic ideas are all of a general kind, necessarily devoid of determination, hence impersonal (see Von Hügel, i. p. 16).

(9) Vol. I. "On the Unchangeableness of God," xxiii.

(10) Vol. I. "On the Creation of the World," LXI.

(11) An unmistakable instance of Stoicism is Philo's remark : "Every man in regard of his intellect is connected with Divine reason, being an impression of, or a fragment or a ray of that blessed nature ; but in regard of the structure of his body he is connected with the universal world." (Vol. I. "On the Creation of the World," LI). These ideas are

paralleled by the Stoical teaching of the human soul as an emanation of the world soul.

(12) Philo's relations to the Halacha and Haggada, whether as recipient or as giver, have been investigated by, among others, Z. Frankel, in his book on *The Influence of the Palestinian Exegesis upon the Alexandrian Hermeneutics*; B. Ritter, *Philo and the Halacha*; Siegfried, *Philo of Alexandria as Exponent of the Old Testament*. The assumption on the part of all these writers seems to be, that the resemblances between Philonic and Rabbinic ideas do not necessarily imply borrowing on either side. The same ideas may have been in vogue in Palestine and Alexandria concurrently.

(13) Graetz, *History of the Jews* (Eng. trans.), vol. ii. chap. vii.

(14) Graetz, *History of the Jews* (Eng. trans.), vol. ii. chap. iii.

(15) In T. B. Niddah 69b allusion is made to the "twelve questions which the men of Alexandria asked of R. Joshua ben Hananya." The latter was a Palestinian, and it is quite possible that the questions were addressed to him while making a sojourn in Alexandria.

(16) Vol. I. "The Allegories of the Sacred Laws" (Book I.), III. VII.

(17) Vol. I. "The Allegories of the Sacred Laws" (Book III.), xvii.

(18) Vol. I. "The Allegories of the Sacred Laws" (Book I.), XIV.

(19) Vol. I. "The Worse plotting against the Better," XLII. See also Vol. II. "On Dreams being sent by God," XI. XXXI (Book I.).

(20) See Note 11.

(21) Vol. II. "On Fugitives," XIII.

(22) Vol. I. "On the Creation of the World," XLVI.

(23) Vol. II. "On Dreams being sent from God" (Book II.), XXXVIII.

(24) Vol. II. "Who is the Heir of Divine Things," XLVIII.

(25) Vol. II. "On Fugitives," xx. In Philo's allegorical identification here of the High Priest with the Logos we get another typical instance of his blending Greek with Hebrew ideas.

(26) Vol. II. "On the Confusion of Languages," XXVIII.

(27) Vol. II. "On Dreams being sent from God" (Book I.), XII., *ibid.* XIX.

(28) Vol. II. "On Fugitives," I.

(29) Vol. I. "On the Creation of the World," XXIV.

(30) Another way which Philo adopted to get out of the difficulty is his ingenious theory of the two original Adams : (1) the Heavenly, (2) the Earthly. The former is the Scriptural first man who was made in the image and likeness of God; he is imperishable, "an idea or a genus perceptible only by the intellect." The latter is man as we see him now in the races of the world, imperfect and corruptible. Philo deduces his former view from the account of man's creation in Genesis i. 26, and his latter view from Genesis ii. 7. But an intermingling of Greek and Rabbinic doctrine is here very apparent. Philo is following Plato's well-known theory of ideas and combining with it the basic thought contained in several Midrashic statements about the absolute perfection of the first man "who reached from Earth to Heaven" and was wonderfully gifted, in ever so many other ways. (See the Midrashim on the various

passages in the early part of Genesis dealing with the Creation and fall of man.)

(31) Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, ii.

(32) Genesis Rabba viii. 4.

(33) See Note 25.

(34) Vol. II. "Who is the Heir of Divine Things," XLII.

(35) Vol. III. "Life of Moses," XIV. (Book III.).

(36) Besides the Gospels, see 2 Corinthians iv. 4, 1 Corinthians viii. 6; Colossians i. 15, 16; Ephesians i. 10, etc., where all these Philonic ideas of the image, intercessor, etc., are applied to Christ. The usage of the "Word" in St. John's Gospel as the eternal quickening spirit in creation, the world principle, has affinities to the Greek term Logos, which in general Greek philosophy signifies both word and reason ; it seems also to resemble in many respects the Logos of Philo ; and again it bears a striking relation to the Memra of the Targumic literature as well as to the Talmudic identification of the "Word" with the Torah. Thus, take the opening verse of St. John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The Rabbins (in Genesis Rabba i. and other places) in commenting on the Psalmist's utterance, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made" (Psalm xxxiii. 6), say that the Word here is the pre-existent Torah, pre-existent to aid God's purpose in creating the world. הקב"ה מבית בחרה וברא את הארץ. According to T. B. Pesahim 54a, the Torah was "one of the seven things fashioned before the creation of the world." In other passages it is spoken of as "the glorious treasure hidden in the Divine store-house from the first six days of Creation."

(37) There seems some doubt about the correct reading here. Friedmann in his note on this passage says that the word "Jeshurun" in the first line is to be taken as an abstract noun from Josher = "uprightness." In the second line it is the epithet of Israel. So that the sense of the passage would be, that Israel calls God a God of uprightness, and the Holy Spirit follows this up with the complimentary remark to Israel, that this very God of uprightness is the God of no other nation than Israel.

CHAPTER IV

THE SHECHINAH—GENERAL VIEW

GRAETZ was right when he spoke of the Talmud as a “Dædalian maze in which one can scarcely find his way even with the thread of Ariadne.”⁽¹⁾ The Rabbins described it as an ocean on which only the experienced swimmer might dare to venture. The difficulties of Rabbinic literature are the inconsistencies of many of the doctrines to be found there. One must always be prepared for surprises when studying it. It embodies such a huge medley of opinions which it simply states as they were uttered, and leaves unreconciled, scattered, not strung upon any particular thread. Thus, no one will deny that angelology is a subject which embraces a very large space in the Talmud and Midrashim. But yet it is unsystematised. There is no clearly defined doctrine of angels. There is a congeries of opinions, but no one canonical opinion which is finally authoritative and demands acceptance. It is the same with such a highly important subject as sin. No one can say that the Rabbins took up a decisive final attitude towards the theology of sin. And yet they thought strongly and abundantly about it. Of course, after wading through a mass of disconnected, and often mutually contradictory, statements one detects a common purpose and sentiment. One can draw inductions and form conclusions. But it involves considerable research.

And the conclusions arrived at, must always be understood as being the views of the individual investigator. In short, there are doctrines of sin, but no doctrine.

An exactly similar diffuseness of treatment characterises the subject to be dealt with here, viz. the Immanence of God as depicted by the terms Shechinah, Holy Spirit, etc. etc. The scattered elements have to be taken up and classified under different heads. It has to be remembered, that the teachers whose utterances are recorded in Rabbinic literature embraced a period covering several hundreds of years; and therefore in collating the statements on any particular topic we must make allowances for age. It has to be remembered, too, that the ancient Rabbins were not philosophers. They went nearer poetry than philosophy. The poetic vein is discernible in many Haggadic passages. They spoke with simplicity of language and spontaneity. They did not elaborate systems of thought. He that expects to find any philosophical presentation of Divine Immanence in Rabbinic literature, will be disappointed. But that the Rabbins had notions of this Immanence, and gave expression to them, is without doubt. These notions they envisaged in the following ways: by expressions concerning (a) the omnipresence of God; (b) the omnipresence of the Shechinah; (c) the constant presence of the Shechinah in Israel; (d) the universality of the Shechinah as spiritual light; (e) the Holy Spirit in man; (f) the Holy Spirit in Israel; (g) the Holy Spirit in prophetic usage; (h) the Bath Kol; (i) nature and functions of angels.

To deal with the Shechinah first. What is the etymology of the word? It is a noun from "Shachan" = to dwell; but wherever it is found in Targumic or Talmudic literature it is always in the sense of God's dwelling-house, the abiding of God in a certain

spot. Thus in Numbers xxiv. 6 the Jerusalem Targum has the phrase: "just as the heavens which God has spread out for His abode"; in Psalm l. 9 the Targum Jonathan supplements the original text (**אֲקָח מִבֵּיתךְ פֶּרֶת לֹא**) with the words: "from the day that the house of my dwelling has been in ruins," alluding to the cessation of the sacrificial order after the fall of Jerusalem. In Psalm lxv. 2 Onkelos renders the phrase: **אֱלֹהָה דַי שְׁכִינַתְהָ בְּצִיּוֹן** = "God whose abode is in Zion." From meaning the abode of God, the Shechinah gradually came to mean God Himself. The material element was dropped, and the spiritual idea alone was retained. Shechinah became coined as a new word signifying the Godhead quite apart from any notion of place. How this was developed in Rabbinical literature will soon be seen. In the Targumic literature several instances occur. In Exodus xvii. 7 Onkelos gives: "Is the Shechinah of God among us or not?" In Numbers v. 3 the phrase "I dwell among them" is rendered by Onkelos as: "My Shechinah dwells among them." (Jonathan has **שְׁכִינַת קָדוֹשָׁא** = the Shechinah of the Holy One.) In Exodus xix. 18 the Jerusalem Targum translates **בְּאַשְׁר יְדֹעַ עַלְיוֹן הַ** as: "because there was revealed thereon the Glory of God's Shechinah in a flame of fire." In Jeremiah xxxiii. 5 the hiding of God's face appears in Onkelos as the taking away of the Shechinah. In Psalm xliv. 10 the words "and thou goest not forth with our armies" are rendered as "thou causest not thy Shechinah to dwell in our armies." And in the same Psalm, verse 25, we have a passage in Onkelos identical with the one just quoted from Jeremiah. A more telling usage, showing the omnipresence and immanence of the Deity, is Onkelos's rendering of Psalm xvi. 8, "I have set the

Lord before me continually; because His Shechinah dwells upon me, I shall not be moved." The second portion of the verse, which tells of the ever-present dwelling of the Shechinah upon the speaker, is tantamount to, and paralleled by, the first part, in which he tells of the constant presence of God. The word ימינו, "on my right hand," was evidently understood by Onkelos to mean "He [i.e. the Shechinah] is on my right hand." This is a clear personification of the Shechinah, which is regarded as an independent entity, such as is often the case in the Talmud and Midrashim. That the usage of *σκηνή* in the New Testament is a reference to the Rabbinic Shechinah, as is often maintained, seems to be true in some cases but not in all, e.g. the allusion in Hebrews viii. 2, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, can hardly refer to the Shechinah, because a phrase such as "a Minister of the true Shechinah" is quite foreign to Rabbinic modes of expression. The phrase in Acts xv. 16, "and I will build again (τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν) the tabernacle of David which is fallen down," is merely a quotation of Amos ix. 11, and the Hebrew there for tabernacle is רֹאשׁ which = a hut. But the allusion in John i. 14, where the Logos is said to have "dwelt among us" (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) seems a probable reference to Shechinah ideas; and this is borne out when one looks at the usage in that chapter of words like "light," "word," "son," "glory," all of them reminding one of the usage in Rabbinic literature of *Shechinah*, *Or*, *Kabod*, *Yekara* (in Targumic) and the sonship of the Messiah. The passage in Revelation xxi. 3, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God," seems but a reproduction of Ezekiel xxxvii. 27, 28,

where מִזְבֵּחַ and מקדשׁ are used indiscriminately to mean tabernacle or sanctuary, but in a localised sense. Ezekiel is foreshadowing a re-establishment of the Jewish kingdom in the heart of Palestine with David sitting upon the throne. The re-existence of the Temple is, of course, a *sine qua non*; it is the indispensable symbol of national status. Hence, God will establish His sanctuary in the midst of Israel. It is these ideas that are bodily reproduced in Revelation xxi. 3, and there is no hint whatsoever of the Rabbinical view of the spiritual Shechinah.

An examination of Shechinah passages throughout the greater portion of the realm of Rabbinic literature, suggests the following classification of the various senses attaching to the word. I tabulate them as follows (and have discussed them in this order):—

(I.) Conception of Shechinah as Light or other material object.

(II.) Shechinah used in a personified sense under the following aspects:—

(a) Face of Shechinah.

(b) "Cloud," "Wings," etc., of Shechinah.

(c) As the Immanent God in Palestine, Temple, and Synagogue.

(d) As the Immanent God in Israel.

(e) Shechinah and Sin.

(f) Shechinah and Torah.

(g) Shechinah and Word (Dibbur).

(h) The Memra of Targumic literature.

NOTE TO CHAPTER IV

- (1) Graetz, *History of the Jews* (Eng. trans.), vol. iii. p. 481.

CHAPTER V

THE SHECHINAH AS LIGHT OR OTHER MATERIAL OBJECT

THE Rabbins pictured their ideas of the Immanence of God by the figure of material light. The Shechinah is universal light. Sometimes it is universal only as far as Israel is concerned, sometimes it is universal in the fullest sense of the term. It is also oftentimes used to denote the omnipresence of God in the Temple. To materialise the Shechinah as light, is a short step to materialising it as any other substance. This, also, the Rabbins did.

(A) As LIGHT

In T. B. Sabbath 22b the light of the Menorah is a "testimony unto all who come into the world, that the Shechinah rests in Israel." (Repeated in Menahoth 86b.)

In Exodus Rabba xxxvii. 3, "He who does a 'Precept' acts as though he lights a candle before God."⁽¹⁾ The allusion here is rather to the Torah, which, like the Shechinah, is so frequently figuratively represented as light.

In Aboth De R. Nathan, chap. ii., the phrase in Ezekiel xliii. 2, "and the earth shined with His glory," is interpreted as: "this is the face of the Shechinah."

There is an association here, of Shechinah with "Kabod" ("glory") which will be considered later (see Appendix II.). This same Midrashic passage has an interesting allusion to the universally-reaching powers of the angel Gabriel's voice; and this voice is inferior to the universality of God's Voice. The "Voice of God" is, in Rabbinic literature, a companion idea to the Shechinah. Like the latter, it is immanent in man and the world.

In Numbers Rabba xi. 5 the Biblical phrase "May the Lord cause the light of His countenance to shine upon thee" (Numbers vi. 25) is interpreted as "May He give thee of the light of the Shechinah." (Similarly in Sifri on נטה, edit. Friedmann, p. 12.)

In Numbers Rabba xii. 8 there is a comment on Leviticus ix. 24, in which allusion is made to the dazzling brightness of the Shechinah. When the people saw it, they fell on their faces, the light being too strong for them.

In Numbers Rabba xv. 2 the windows of Solomon's Temple were **שׁקופים אֲטוּמִים**, i.e. "narrow within but wide without," in order that the light of the Temple might go out and illumine the world. Here light is certainly meant in the spiritual sense, and most probably to be regarded as identical with Shechinah. (See T. B. Menahoth 86b.)

Ibid. xv. 5, there occurs the phrase, **אתה הוא אורו של עולם**, "Thou art the Light of the World," alluding to the Deity.* Cp. with familiar New Testament expression, John viii. 12.

Ibid. xv. 9. The sun and the moon obtain their

* Cp. what is said in an article by G. Margoliouth in *J.Q.R.* July 1908, on the doctrine of the Ether in the Kabbalah. The idea of **ורא** (primal light) which in Rabbinical literature is, as we see, so much mixed up with mystical teachings about God, seems to me to be the starting-point of the Kabbalistic ideas of **ורא** (primal light), **עריא** (primal ether), and **הרבה** (condensation point) as they appear in the works of Moses de Leon, Abraham Abulafia, Recanati and others. Cp. idea of the "Spark" in the mysticism of Meister Eckhart.

light "from the sparks of the light of above," i.e. the abode of God. The passage goes on, "great is this light for not all creatures possess it; only one in a hundred." This looks like an allusion to the soul or conscience or Divine Spark immanent in man only, who forms about "one-hundredth part" of the general creation.

Deuteronomy Rabba xi. 3 alludes to an imaginary dialogue between Moses and Isaac, in which Isaac is told that his eyes became dimmed through the dazzling light of the Shechinah, which he saw when stretched out on the altar, whereas Moses "spoke with the Shechinah face to face" and met with no such fate.

Tanhuma on נְשָׁרֵת יְהוָה has the following passage: "Whence did Moses obtain his horns of glory? [alluding to Exodus xxxiv. 29]; the sages replied, 'From the cave, as it is said, "And it shall come to pass while my glory passeth by that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock.'" This means that God placed his hand upon him, and from that he obtained the horns of glory" (as it is said in Habakkuk iii. 4, "He had horns coming out of his hand; and there was the hiding of his power"). All these passages figure the Deity as light. The Midrash continues, "And there are some who say that at the time when the Holy One taught Moses the Torah, Moses gained his horns of glory from the sparks which shot out from the mouth of the Shechinah." Here we have a personification of the Shechinah, and of its association with something stronger than ethereal light, viz. material fire. Many such examples have still to be given.

Tanhuma on נְשָׁרֵת speaks of the Tabernacle as being filled "with the light of God and His glory." Here we get a juxtaposition: light and glory; and both are mere synonyms for Shechinah.

Yalkut on Song of Songs gives the following from the Midrash טוֹב שׂוֹהֵר. “Two sparks of fire used to shoot out from between the two staves of the ark [during the Israelites’ pilgrimage through the Desert] and used to burn up the serpents and scorpions, the thorns and briars. . . . When the nations used to see the smoke they used to exclaim, ‘Who is this coming up from the wilderness?’ They used to observe the miracles God did for them . . . and how He in His glory lit up the way for them . . . and used to say, ‘Who is this that looketh as the Dawn? What nation is this whose equipments consist wholly of the light of God?’”⁽²⁾ This is a very crude presentation of the immanent idea.

Closely resembling the usage of Shechinah as light is the usage of the phrase “Ziv Ha-Shechinah,” i.e. “the shining of the Shechinah.” The two are sometimes interchanged in the different parts of Talmud and Midrash. The word is used in other connexions as well, e.g. Onkelos on 1 Kings vi. 1 translates the words “in the month Ziv” as זיו נצניא, “the shining [or blossoming] of the flowers.” In T. B. Sotah 49a we get: “the shining splendour of wisdom, of priesthood.” (For the examples, see Levy’s *Wörterbuch*, page 213.) Instances of the usage of “Ziv Ha-Shechinah” are the following:—

Song of Songs Rabba iii. 8 compares the אורה מועד being full of the “Ziv” to a cave by the sea. The sea rushes in and fills the cave, but the sea suffers no diminution of its waters. It is as full as before. Just so the tent of the congregation. The Divine presence filled it, but it filled the world just the same.*

* There is a passage in the *Confessions of St. Augustine* which has a curious resemblance to this simile of the sea and the cave. It reads thus: “But Thee, O Lord, I imagined on every part surrounding and penetrating it, but in every

Numbers Rabba xxi. 16 states that the angels are fed on the “Ziv” (similar in Tanhuma on פנה). Koheleth Rabba viii. 3 attributes the “Ziv” to the Israelites when they stood at Sinai. (The Pesikta on פראשת פרה connects this statement with the verse in Ezekiel xvi. 14. It is a material idea—splendour of countenance.)

Mechilta on יתרו (edit. Friedmann, p. 66) speaks of the houses of the Israelites being filled with the “Ziv” at the time when they stood before Sinai to receive the Law. (A longer form of this, together with the part played by Jethro and Balaam, is given in the earlier part of יתרו and also in T. B. Zebahim 116a.) In Yalkut Koheleth viii. (based on the Sifri) the “Ziv” is given to them not in their homes, but while standing at Sinai. The following remark is added : “But no sooner did they exclaim, ‘These are thy Gods, O Israel,’ than they were made the enemies of God.” The Shechinah departed from them.

Yalkut on Joshua xxii. (from T. B. Moed Katan 9a) attributes the possession of the “Ziv” to the Israelites when dismissed to their homes after witnessing the dedication of Solomon’s Temple (1 Kings viii. 66).⁽⁸⁾ Yalkut on Psalm viii. (from T. B. Sabbath 88a) gives the legend of Moses in conflict with the angels, when the former was about to receive the Torah. Moses fears that he might be burned by the angels’ breath, but God protects him by spreading the “Ziv” over him (this being the Rabbinic interpretation of Job xxvi. 9).*

direction infinite ; as if there were a sea, everywhere and on every side, through unmeasured space, one only infinite sea ; and it contained within it some sponge, huge but infinite ; that sponge must needs in all its parts be filled from that unmeasured sea, so I imagined Thy finite creation full of Thee, the Infinite.”

* It is worth remarking here that in the mysticism of Plotinus (born A.D. 205, at Lycopolis in Egypt) the master mind of Neo-Platonic mysticism, one meets with a similar figurative representation of soul or mind as being “an overflow” from God, or as “radiating from God as light does from a luminous body which sends its light into the darkness but yet suffers no diminution of itself in the process.”

Yalkut on Psalm xlv. gives the saints in the glorious future, the privilege of feeding on the "Ziv." But the food is to be spiritual, not material. Cp. this with the Leviathan legends in Rabbinic literature. The Midrash continues "and they will receive no injury." This is connected with what we had before, about the association of Shechinah with fire. It belongs to a crude, early order of ideas.

There is an interesting passage in the Commentary of Nahmanides on Exodus xvi. 6, bearing strongly on the mystical aspect of the "Ziv." He quotes the Rabbinic interpretations (given in T. B. Yoma 75b) of the Psalmist's phrase: "Man did eat angels' food" (Psalm lxxviii. 25). In this Yoma passage R. Akiba explains the manna (Exodus xvi.) as "food which the ministering angels eat." But R. Ishmael raises an objection by asking, "Do then the angels eat? Is it not said of Moses when he was in heaven that he neither ate bread nor drank water?" Ishmael accordingly explains *לחם שנבלע באיברים* as *לחם אבירום*, "bread which assimilated itself in the limbs." Nahmanides elevates these differing opinions of Akiba and Ishmael to a higher plane, by putting a spiritual-mystical interpretation upon them. According to Akiba, says he, "the eaters of the manna and the ministering angels were fed by one and the same food." And what was this food? It was the "Ziv." The latter is the ordinary angels' food, and it became the food of the Israelites of the time through the fact that, as he says, "the manna was one of the products of the Higher Light (i.e. *מוחילדות האור העליון*) which became materialised, i.e. took on physical properties by the will of God." According however to R. Ishmael, says Nahmanides, there was no material manna whatsoever. The eaters of it subsisted entirely and solely upon the *האור העליון*.

רְמַנִּידָס. This is the only way, continues Nahmanides, in which you can explain the Rabbinic statement about the manna suiting itself to the taste of every individual Israelite, "for the soul in its process of thinking joins itself to the Higher Beings, finding therein the true delights of Life and obtaining favour from before Him." In other words, the manna-eaters were men, whose spiritual faculties were developed to so high a pitch, that their sustaining nourishment was the union of their soul with the Divine. Nahmanides dilates, in a similar strain, upon the remark of the Mechilta on Exodus xvi. 25, "to-day ye shall not find it in the field," i.e. says the Mechilta, "Ye shall not find it in this life, but ye shall find it in the life to come." Not all the Israelites, at this epoch, says Nahmanides, had reached the high spiritual stage of subsisting upon the "Ziv," i.e. complete union with God. After the emancipation from Egypt, however, and when at the crossing of the Red Sea, it was possible "for a maid to have visions such as were not vouchsafed even to Ezekiel the prophet," the necessary high spiritual stage was attained. This spiritualisation of the "life-to-come" idea follows the lines of Maimonides' theology (see his Introduction to last chapter of T. B. Sanhedrin). Nahmanides, however, is unwilling thus to abandon absolutely the generally accepted view of the "life to come," and he accordingly brings his exposition into line with the Rabbinical dictum about there being no eating nor drinking in the life to come, but only the saints sitting with crowns upon their heads and enjoying the "Ziv." "Ye shall find it in the life to come." The worthy Israelite will find his manna, i.e. his source of continued vitality, even after death; he will find it in that blessed union with the Shechinah for which he

has qualified himself in ascending stages of spiritual saintliness. He will wear the crown upon his head! Does not the prophet predict that "in that day the Lord of Hosts shall be for a Crown of Glory" (Isaiah xxviii. 5)? There will be a complete merging of the human life and the Divine life.*

The Yalkut on Ezekiel xlivi. (from Genesis Rabba lxxxiii.) gives two versions of the creation of light. (1) God wrapped Himself up in a garment the splendour of which lit up the world from end to end. (2) The source and fountain-head of light was the Temple at Jerusalem (based on verses in Ezekiel xlivi. 2, where the word "Glory" bears the twofold meaning often assigned to it by the Rabbins, viz. (a) the glory of God; (b) the Temple at Jerusalem). There is a spiritual significance attaching to these phrases about light, and they belong to the department of Shechinah ideas (for repetition of this, see Yalkut on Psalm civ.).

Yalkut on Psalm lxxii. states that just as the sun and moon light up the world, so in the future will the pious light up the world, as it is said (Isaiah lx. 3), "And the nations shall come to thy light." It is noteworthy that not only is the influence of the Deity compared to light in respect of its omnipresence and all-pervasiveness, but also the influence of good men possesses the same immanent power on the world.†

Another materialistic description of the Shechinah is that which ascribes wings to it—the "Wings of the

* In the language of mysticism, "Life is an eternal Becoming, a ceaseless changefulness" (from Miss Underhill's *Mysticism*, p. 35).

† With this Rabbinical usage of fire, light, etc. in association with Shechinah may be compared the mystical allusions to lamps of fire, lightnings, etc. in the N.T. Apocalypse, e.g. "And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God" (iv. 5). Probably the symbolism of Zechariah iv., the seven-branched candlestick and the symbolic interpretation given it by the prophet, lie at the bottom of this passage. So also probably does Psalm civ. 4, "His ministers a flaming fire." But its usage here to denote an aspect of Divine agency in the world, has resemblances to Shechinah ideas which are too obvious to be overlooked.

Shechinah." As the Rabbins were fond of representing the presence of the Shechinah as confined to Israel, to the exclusion of the nations of the world, the "Wings of the Shechinah" came to be a term denoting proselytism. To bring any one under the wings of the Shechinah commonly means to introduce a non-Israelite into the fold of Israel. But this is by no means the exclusive significance of the expression. It often bears the wider meaning of the protective aspect of the Divine omnipresence or immanence.

The Mechilta on בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (ed. Friedmann, page 56) ב' has the following passage: "R. Joshua said that when Amalek came to injure Israel and prevent him from abiding beneath the wings of his Father in heaven, Moses exclaimed, 'Sovereign of the universe, this miscreant is about to destroy thy children from underneath thy wings, who then will be left to read and study the Torah which thou hast given them ?'"

R. Eliezer Ha-Modai said that when Amalek came to injure Israel and prevent him from abiding beneath the wings of his Father in heaven, Moses exclaimed, "Sovereign of the universe, thy sons are about to be scattered to the four corners of heaven, as it is said, 'For I have spread you abroad as the four winds of heaven, saith the Lord' (Zech. ii. 6), will this miscreant come to exterminate them from beneath thy wings ?" In this Midrash we singularly get the direct expression "wings of God" rather than the more usual "wings of the Shechinah." There is no notion of proselytism. The "wings" are God's omnipresence in Israel, His fatherly immanence. There are several versions of the old Rabbinic commentary on Genesis xii. 5, "And the souls which they had gotten in Haran." The וְיָצַא, "they made" (literally), is explained as: "they caused them to enter under the wings of the Shechinah."

This in some instances is made identical with proselytism, but in others it rather means that the omnipresence of God became a reality to them. Thus Genesis Rabba xxxix. 14 has the former view; so has Genesis Rabba lxxxiv. 4, and also Song of Songs Rabba i. The later and broader view is seen in Aboth De R. Nathan, chap. xii., and in the Tanhuma on ל' ל'.⁽⁴⁾ The latter graphically narrates how the weary and footsore strangers whom Abraham welcomed into his home were wont, after they had finished their meal, to begin praising and blessing their generous and true-hearted host. No! he would reply, "do not bless me, but rather Him who gives His food and drink to all creatures and has put His spirit into them." "But where is He?" they would ask in astonishment. Abraham would reply, "He rules over heaven and earth. He killeth and maketh alive; He woundeth and healeth; He formeth the foetus in its mother's womb, and bringeth it out to the light of the world; He causeth the trees and flowers to spring up; He bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up again." By these means He initiated them into the fear of God and the practise of morality. This long passage on the omnipresence of God seems to be an expansion of, or commentary on, the phrase in the other Midrashim about "entering under the wings of the Shechinah."⁽⁵⁾ The Sifri on זורת הרכה speaks of "Moses lying dead in the wings (בגפי) of the Shechinah" (Friedmann points out here that the reading in the corresponding passage in Yalkut is the usual בוגדי not בוגדי which is uncommon). The soul of the great law-giver lies enwrapped in the great world-soul.

Yalkut on Jeremiah chap. li. speaks of the descendants of Nebuchadnezzar as wanting to enter under the wings of the Shechinah. Upon which the angels exclaim, "Sovereign of the universe, wilt thou take under

thy wings the children of that wicked one who laid waste thy holy house and set thy Temple in flames?" Judging from the general drift of the whole context, there seems to be the proselyte idea here.

Yalkut on Job xx. 27, "The heavens shall reveal his iniquity ; and the earth shall rise up against him," has the following : "Thus said Moses to the Israelites, 'Perhaps you want to fly away from the wings of the Shechinah or to disappear from the earth ! No ! the heavens will write down [your evil desire] and the earth will make it known, as it is said, "The heavens shall reveal his iniquity ; and the earth shall rise up against him."'" Here the phrase "Wings of Shechinah" unquestionably points to God's immanence in the world.

The Tanna Debe Elijah on ל' שׁ (quoted by Yalkut on same passage) has a remarkable passage on the entry of the twelve spies into Palestine, and concludes with the sentence : "I call heaven and earth to witness that it was not in the mind of the Holy One to slay ten princes of Israel ; for they ran after Moses and Aaron until they entered under the wings of the Shechinah." Here "wings of the Shechinah" cannot have a proselyte meaning, as the princes were Israelites. It seems to be perhaps a poetical expression for "life." They were suffered by God to live, *i.e.* God took them under the wings of His Shechinah.* It is the manifestation of God's protective care which covers the world, just as the wings of the bird cover and protect her young. It seems obvious, that the various epithets attached to the word "Shechinah" came in course of usage, to apply to many ideas other than those originally intended.

The next materialised description of Shechinah, is that which depicts it by the figure of a cloud—the

* Or it may be an allusion to death ; we have instances in Rabbinical literature of men seeing Shechinah at the hour of death.

Cloud of Shechinah. The allusions to this are not very copious.* The idea is based on Exodus xl. 34-38, the cloud of the Tabernacle. A parallel phrase and one which occurs rather more frequently is "clouds of glory"—Kabod being often synonymous with Shechinah. (See Appendix II.)

Tanhuma on במדבר tells that the "cloud of the Shechinah" did not descend upon the Tabernacle until Moses said, "Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel" (Numbers x. 36). It continues: "The clouds of glory were surrounding it" (*i.e.* the Tabernacle, or possibly Moses), and the Holy Spirit exclaimed by Solomon, "Thou art beautiful, O my beloved, as Tirzah" (Song of Songs vi. 4). "Why as Tirzah (תירזה) ? because I am appeased (מתרזה) unto thee." The juxtaposition of all three Rabbinic expressions of Divine immanence, Shechinah, Kabod, and Holy Spirit is significant. Yalkut on Song of Songs, "His left hand is under my head, and His right hand doth embrace me" (chapter ii. verse 6), says "this alludes to the clouds of Shechinah which surround Israel above and below." We could not get a more explicit statement of God as being immanent in Israel.†

We now take miscellaneous materialistic descriptions of Shechinah.

In T. B. Soṭah 9b "the Shechinah was beating before Samson like a bell" (פנוי צוֹג לְפָנֶיךָ תִּשְׁקַט). This is a commentary on Judges xiii. 25, "And the Spirit of

* See Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 191, where it is pointed out that in Exodus xxxiii. 9 it is the cloud that is depicted as speaking with Moses, and that the R.V. emendation of "the Lord" before "speak" is incorrect. But see Rashi *ad loc.* The R.V. is in agreement with Rashi's view.

† In the sense that God is brought down from lonely heights. Israel, surrounded by Him "above and below," is, as it were, shrouded in divinity. It is in this sense that many oncoming references to "surrounding" have to be understood.

the Lord began to move him.”* Samson is said by the Rabbins (in this passage in *Sotah*) to have been imbued with the spirit of prophecy which possessed the patriarch Jacob. Rashi (*ad loc.*) interprets the idea of the bell by remarking “to accompany him [Samson] whithersoever he went.” The Shechinah filled Samson’s environment. God’s presence was real to him everywhere.

In *Song of Songs Rabba ii.* the Shechinah is visible from between the shoulders and fingers of the priests at the time they pronounce the priestly benediction upon Israel. (See also *Numbers Rabba xi. 2.*)⁽⁶⁾

In *Tanhuma* on אהרי מורה there is a curious expression about Aaron’s rod as מרים בשכינה, “scenting the Shechinah.” It was this, according to the Midrash, that caused it to bring forth fruit. The following remark then occurs: “Dry sticks scented that [or Him] which was the Life of the World.” The Shechinah is here parallel to the “Life of the World,” an unmistakable allusion to the Deity as the immanent life of the universe.[†]

The idea of being injured by the Shechinah or escaping injury from it is fairly common. We saw something of this when dealing with the materialised conception of Shechinah as light or fire. In *Yalkut* on *Song of Songs i.* there occurs the following: “Why does he compare the Holy One to a bundle of myrrh” (*Song i. 13*)? Because the whole world is not large enough to contain Him, and yet He can compress the Shechinah into the narrow space between the two staves of the ark. You will find that God loves Israel more

* The Hebrew for “to move him” belongs to the same root as the Hebrew for “bell.”

[†] An idea to be found frequently in the Jewish Liturgy. See *Authorised Daily Prayer Book* (ed. Singer), p. 17, p. 127, etc. See also poem commencing known in the *Day of Atonement Liturgy* (Morning Service). This composition is brimful with the developed Kabbalistic ideas of the Middle Ages.

than the ministering angels, for the latter can only approach God at an intervening distance of fifteen cubits, as it is said (*Isaiah vi.*): "Seraphim stood above him," but the Israelites stood in the Tabernacle, and not one among them was injured. There are several ideas here:—

(1) The ark was pervaded with the omnipresence of God.

(2) The paradox (often repeated in the Rabbinic literature and dwelt on by Philo) of the world being too small to hold God but yet the space between the Ark's staves being large enough (cp. *Genesis Rabba* iv. 5). It is clear that the later Kabbalistic doctrine of "Zimzum" ("contraction") took its start from this Rabbinic idea.

(3) The identification of Shechinah with God.

(4) The Israelites ranking above the angels in respect of nearness to God.

(5) The Shechinah as an expression for God's immanence in the Tabernacle.

(6) The idea of being hurt by the Shechinah.

Another good instance of the last idea is to be found in *Yalkut* on *Isaiah* on the verse "And the Lord shall blot out tears from off all faces" (xxv. 8). "In this world he who sees the face of the Shechinah is מחרת רלוּם (*i.e.* gradually wastes, dies away), as it is said, "For no man shall see me, and live" (*Exodus xxxiii. 20*).

The Midrash verifies the statement by quoting *Ezra* viii. 15, "And I viewed the people and priests, and found there none of the sons of Levi."* A remark of the same drift is that of *Yalkut* on *Isaiah* xxxv., "At

* I cannot discover the ground on which the Midrash bases its deduction from this verse of *Ezra*. Mr. Israel Abrahams suggests the following: "The Levites in exile mutilated their fingers in order to prevent themselves from playing the harps and singing the songs of the Lord on the land of the stranger" (see *Rashi* on *T. B. Kiddushin*, 69b).

the time when God reveals His Shechinah to Israel, He does not reveal it there all at once, because the Israelites would not be able to endure that great boon, and would all die off suddenly. . . . But what does God do? He reveals it to them bit by bit. At first He causes the desert to rejoice (*Isaiah xxxv. 1*); afterwards, He makes it blossom as the rose (*ibid. 1*); after that again, the glory of Lebanon is given it (*ibid. 2*), until finally, all the people see the glory of God (*ibid. 2*). It is obvious from these remarks, that the Rabbins discerned a religious message in the world of nature. They saw God in the blossoming field as well as in the solitude of the desert. And yet, as we saw before, they materialised the Shechinah so very much.

Yet another specimen of this materialisation is to be found in *Yalkut* on *בְּחַלְתָּךְ* commenting on verse “Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered” (*Numbers x. 35*). Moses sought to let the Israelites know that the Shechinah was with them because he had had the Divine promise, “Behold, I send an angel before thee” (*Exodus xxiii. 20*).¹⁷ When God promised him that “My presence shall go with thee” (*Exodus xxxiii. 14*), Moses comes and says to the people, “Arise and journey, for verily the Shechinah is in the Ark.” The people replied, “We do not believe this.” Immediately, Moses exclaimed, “Rise up, Lord, let thine enemies be scattered” (*Numbers x. 35*). Forthwith “the Ark trembled with movement and the people believed.” This movement was the movement of the Shechinah, which, in this passage, is looked upon as the material indwelling of God in the midst of Israel.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

(1) In T. B. Pesahim 5a we get the question, "To what may the saints be likened in comparison with God?" And the answer is, "As a candle before a torch."

(2) In the Midrash Yelamdenu on תְּלִבָּנָה there is a more lengthy form of this serpents and scorpions tale. There is added to it one of the king-parables so common in the Midrashic literature.

(3) T. B. Berachoth 64a assigns the "Ziv" to every one who "partakes of a meal at which a 'Talmid haham' is present." This is part of an oft-recurring Rabbinic idea. The pious student of the Torah possesses a special degree of Divine Immanence; and he is able, so to speak, to shed this godliness upon those in contact with him. Thus the proverb, טוב ליהיך טוב לשבנו, "Well-being to the saint implies well-being to his neighbour; וְאֵין לְרוּשׁ אֵין לְשָׁבֵן, "Woe to the sinner means woe to his neighbour," holds a purely religious as well as ethical import.

(4) In Tanhuma on יַעֲלֹת Ruth's change of faith is expressed by בְּנֵי הַשְׁכִּינָה. Here we get the pure proselyte idea; so also in Tanhuma on תְּרִיז, where Jethro is described as follows: "He was an idolatrous priest, but came and cleaved to Moses and entered underneath the wing of the Shechinah." Still there is no reason to assume that Jethro actually became a proselyte. The Rabbis held conflicting views on the point. According to Exodus Rabba i. 35, xxvii. 2, Jethro merely abandoned idol-worship because he thought it foolish. According to Mechilta on תְּרִיז Jethro gave Zipporah as wife to Moses, on condition that he brought up their eldest son in the worship of idols; and Moses swore to respect this condition. Jethro could not surely have desired such an object had he abandoned idolatry.

(5) The Yalkut on Isaiah xli (and again on Psalm cx.) has the broader view (based on the verse "אֵין כָּבוֹד וְכֵן") of Abraham sitting on God's right hand (Psalm cx. 1) and stirring up the nations to come under the wings of the Shechinah. This may mean either mere abandonment of idolatry, or a recognition of a universalistic Deity.

(6) A glaring instance of the material conception of Shechinah is also furnished by a passage in T. B. Megillah 29a. "The father of Samuel and Levi were once sitting in the synagogue of 'Shef Ve-Yatib,' in Nehardea. They suddenly heard a sound of movement. It was the Shechinah coming. They at once rose and went out. R. Shesheth (who was blind) was once sitting in the same synagogue, and when the Shechinah came, he did not go out. Then the ministering angels came and struck terror into him . . ." In the end R. Shesheth addresses the Shechinah, and the latter advises the angels to cease from vexing him. The ideas here are (a) the Shechinah is something material that can be heard and seen; (b) it is a Person to be addressed and prayed to.

(7) Noteworthy here is the identification of Shechinah with angel, just as we saw Philo identify the latter with Logos or Logoi.

CHAPTER VI

SHECHINAH PERSONIFIED

THE Shechinah has a “Face,” פָנֵי הַשְׁכִינָה. It often speaks and acts, sings with joy or cries with grief, admonishes and remarks and encourages, becomes angry and appeased again, in just the same way that a human being does all these things. No dualism of deities is thereby intended. The sinfulness of recognising בֶּרְשִׁיותָם (“two divinities”) was reiterated by the Rabbins with untiring emphasis. This personification is probably the old Biblical anthropomorphic description of God carried over to the Shechinah. The immanent presence of God in Israel, in the world, and in man is a personality, and is looked upon and described as possessing all the attributes which are commonly associated with personality.⁽¹⁾

(A) THE “FACE OF THE SHECHINAH”

In T. B. Barachoth 64a, “He that goes out from the synagogues and enters the House of Study to engage in the Torah will have the merit of receiving the Face of the Shechinah.”

In T. B. Sanhedrin 103a, “There are four classes of men who will never receive the Face of the Shechinah, viz. scoffers, liars, hypocrites, and calumniators.

Leviticus Rabbi xxiii. 13, “He that sees the nakedness of another’s body and does not feast his eyes

thereon, will be worthy to receive the face of the Shechinah."

T. B. Sukkah 45b, "The world will never have less than thirty-six saints who will receive the Shechinah every day."

Leviticus Rabba xxx. 2, also the Tanna Debe Elijahu ii. give another version of the foregoing passage as follows : "There are seven classes of saints who will in the future time receive the Face of the Shechinah. . . ." (2)

Song of Songs Rabba ii., as also Mechilta on תְּהִלָּה (reproduced in Yalkut ad loc.) has "He who visits the 'Haber' acts as though he received the Face of the Shechinah." (3)

Numbers Rabba xix. 18, Tanhumta on נַפְרָנָה has the following quaint assertion : "All the saints who will be descended from Adam will suffer the primordial Divine decree of death. But before their death they will see the Face of the Shechinah and reprove Adam, saying, 'It is thou that hast been the cause of death to us!'" *

* The idea of seeing the Shechinah when man is at the point of death occurs in Rabbinic literature in various forms and presents some difficulties. As far as my investigations go, I conclude that it is the result of the combination of several ideas, Biblical and post Biblical. These are (1) an idea such as is found in Judges xiii. 22, "And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God" (cp. *ibid.* vi. 22). Just as there are passages in the O.T. where God is represented as walking and talking familiarly with men, so there are places, like the one here, which show that it was, at one time, a firm belief that to see God meant death to man. (2) Mystical ideas found occasionally in the Psalms, e.g. "For Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell ; neither wilt Thou suffer Thy pious one to see corruption. Then will I show me the path of life : in Thy presence is fulness of joy ; at Thy right hand pleasures for evermore" (Psalm xvi. 10-11). In the moment of highest mystic rapture, the good man feels that death will not be the evil that men imagine, not merely a prolongation of life in another form, but a heightening of life to the highest possible stage, a life in God. Man will then attain his highest bliss, his truest goal, he will live in the contemplation of the Shechinah. The O.T. is not plentiful in this exalted teaching of the spiritual life of man after death. But if one reads several passages, particularly of the Psalms, from this mystical standpoint, one can easily see that the Jews of those epochs had undoubtedly glimmerings of it, and knew how to give expression to it. It is quite easy to see, how the characters of Elijah and Enoch who "were not, because God took them," must have impressed themselves upon the ancient Jews as the highest

Deuteronomy Rabba vii. 8 declares that in the days of Moses the ordinary Israelite had the privilege of being spoken to by the Shechinah "Face to face"; a privilege not even accorded in later times to Ezekiel the Prophet.

Yalkut Psalm xvii., "How great is the virtue of charity! If a man gives only one coin to a poor brother, he becomes worthy to receive the Face of the Shechinah."

Ibid. "Even the evil-doers, provided they have given alms to the poor, will have the merit of receiving the Face of the Shechinah." *

Exodus Rabba v. 9 has a peculiar usage of דו פְּרָצֹפִין, "two faces" (פְּרָצֹה = Greek πρόσωπον).⁽⁴⁾ The question discussed is, "How did the voice [at Sinai] issue forth?" And the reply is, that it went out in דו פְּרָצֹפִין, on the one hand putting to death the idolatrous nations who would not accept it, and on the other hand, giving life unto the Israelites who accepted the Torah. The probable explanation of the phrase is, as the author of the commentary סגנין משֵׁה דַי says = בְּשֻׁנִי — "in two different styles." To the Israelites the Voice had a quickening vitalising tone. To the idolaters it sounded as a death-knell—and in fact became the harbinger of death. But what one has to notice is the peculiar tendency to personification. The Voice of God had "Faces." This shows that the "Voice" was often

and sublimest types of life divinely led; and it is quite natural to suppose, that a spiritual life of this kind after death, was the aspiration cherished by the best and worthiest souls among them. The Rabbins seem to have adopted some such doctrine as this, and individualised it still further. The meriterious Jew beholds the Shechinah at death, i.e. no Sheol or Gehinnom awaits him—these ideas belong to a lower strata of Biblical and Rabbinic thought; he passes into the world of Divine light and life, there to get that nearness to God which it is so hard to get while in the coils of the ordinary mortality. I am aware, however, that the views of the best Christian scholars to-day are opposed to any such theory as this.

* Here we have an instance of what we alluded to in a previous note, viz. the seeing of Shechinah when man is at the point of death.

conceived by the Rabbins in the same immanent sense as the Shechinah. There are numerous examples of this in Rabbinic literature.⁽⁵⁾*

An even more striking instance of the "Face" not of the Shechinah but connected with it, is the following from Tanhuma on בְּדָר. Manasseh, King of Israel, makes an idol and places it in the Holy of Holies (2 Chronicles xxxiii. 7).^(5a) God resents this, and says that Manasseh's object in placing the idol there was "to drive out Me from the Holy House." At first the idol had only one פָּרֶצֶת and it was placed in the western corner of the Temple. The Shechinah then went to another corner from which the "Face" could not be seen. When Manasseh saw this, he made four פָּרֶצֶת to the idol, in order that the Shechinah might be utterly banished from the Temple. This ascription of a פָּרֶצֶת to an idol is extraordinary! It shows clearly that these forms of personification of the Shechinah have a strongly materialist basis. The foregoing Midrash also points to one distinctly-marked department of Rabbinic thought on Immanence, viz. the Immanence of God in the Temple.⁽⁶⁾

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

(1) The phrase מִקְרֵב פָּנֵים, literally "receiving the face of," is also used of ordinary social intercourse, and means "to receive a friend," or "to visit the house of a friend," as e.g. the Rabbinic injunction that "It is the duty of every man to visit the house of his master on the festival."

* This curious intermingling of visual with auditory sensations is a striking feature of mystical experience. For an excellent psychological analysis of the subject, see Miss Underhill's chapter on "Voices and Visions" in her book on Mysticism already alluded to. "Plotinus," says Miss Underhill, "sees the Celestial Venus, Suso the Eternal Wisdom, St. Theresa the humanity of Christ, Blake the strange personages of his prophetic books" (p. 326). Interpreting the Israelitish encampment at Sinai from the same standpoint, we can very well say, that so overcome were the Israelites with the momentousness of the Revelation, that in their profound state of mystical reverie, they objectivised the Voice, giving it a pictorial form, while at the same time hearing it as a distinct articulate inward voice.

The Tanhuma on *בְּנֵי חֶסֶד* has the remark: "He that visits (or receives) an old man acts as though he were to receive the face of the Shechinah." Here the two ideas are conjoined.

(2) It is to be noted that clustering round the usage of *פָּנִים* there is nearly always the idea of futurity. The phrase usually runs *עַתָּה לְקַבֵּל חֶסֶד*, "will, in the future, receive the face of the Shechinah." What is this future? It is difficult to answer. The phrase seems to cover and convey a variety of meanings. As will be seen from the instances given, it often alludes to the bliss of a future life after death. God will be immanent in the soul of the departed saint. Mortal spirit will mingle with immortal. The human soul will become part of the Divine world-soul. The phrase, "But the soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God" (1 Samuel xxv. 29), an idea oft repeated in parts of the Jewish liturgy to-day, seems to have a similar meaning. The passage in T. B. Sanhedrin 103a (same in T. B. Sotah 42b) about the "four classes who will not receive the face of the Shechinah, viz. the scoffers, the liars, the hypocrites, and the calumniators," also seems to allude to the spiritual condemnation of their souls after death. In fact, the Rabbinic interpretation of "cutting off of the soul" seems to belong to exactly the same order of ideas as this of "not receiving the face of the Shechinah." Where no futurity is alluded to, as in a remark like that of T. B. Sabbath 127a, "The entertaining of strangers on Sabbath is a greater virtue than that of receiving the Face of the Shechinah," the allusion seems to be either to the appearance at the Temple festivities on the three great festivals of the year (the Temple being the place where the Shechinah was particularly immanent) or to attendance at synagogue (which also is always described as pervaded by the Shechinah). A saying like this, about the high sanctity implied in the entertainment of strangers at home, is a good specimen of Rabbinical ethical teachings. A home where charity is dispensed is holier than even Temple or synagogue.

Further, the fact that "receiving the face of the Shechinah" may allude to the appearance of the Israelite at the Temple festivities on the three great Festivals, is patent from a statement like the following in *Aboth De R. Nathan* xii., *אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי אֹרֶם שְׁמַחוֹן וְלִכְיָן לְהַקְבִּיל פָּנֵי חֶסֶד בְּמִזְבֵּחַ*.

. . . "These are the men who forsake their silver and their gold, and go up to receive the Face of the Shechinah in the Temple."

(3) For a comprehensive sketch of the nature and history of the *חֶסֶד* in the Talmud, see the excellent article "Haber" in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. vi.

(4) The word *בָּנִים* (=Greek δύο) is sometimes spelt *בָּנִי*, which is more in accord with phonology. The phrase *בָּנִים בָּנִים* occurs very frequently in connexion with the Rabbinic legends about the formation of the first woman. Cp. T. B. Erubin 18a, *בָּנִי בָּנִצְפָּן הִי לוּ לְאָדָם תְּאַשֵּׂן*, "Adam had originally two faces." Out of one of these, Eve was created. Similarly T. B. Berachoth 61a.

(5) See Exodus Rabba xxviii. 6.

(5a) In T. B. Sanhedrin 103b there is a slightly different version of Manasseh's idol.

(6) The ascription of a "Face" to the Shechinah is sometimes also expressed by the word **לִמְרָא** (Greek *εἰκών*, *εἰκόνιον* = image). It is the Jerusalem Targum for **לִמְרָא** = "likeness" (see Genesis Rabba xl. 5, Leviticus Rabba xxiii. 12, where it is used of a painter). But in the following passage in the Tanhuma on **בְּרֵאשֶׁת** it is used of the image of God which is immanent in the world. "If a mortal king engraves his image upon a tablet, the tablet is larger than the image. But God is great, and yet His image is greater than the whole world." God is in the world but is greater than it; the world is only a part of God.

CHAPTER VII

(B) GENERAL PERSONIFICATION

T. B. HAGGIGAH 15b, also in T. B. Sanhedrin 46a, "When man is in trouble what does the Shechinah say?" קָלַנִי מַרְאֵשִׁי, קָלַנִי מַזְרוּעַ "I feel a weariness in my head; I feel a weariness in my arm." (See Rashi in Sanhedrin 46a for etymology of קָלַנִי, a strange term.) The underlying idea in a statement like this seems to be the ever-constant presence of the Shechinah when man is in trouble. Man is so closely hedged round by the Divine that the latter even feels the pain of the former.

T. B. Sotah 5a, "The Shechinah mourns over the proud man." The elucidation of this saying is given in an adjoining passage, which reads as follows: "If a man is proud, God says 'that man and I cannot dwell together. There is no room in the world for both of us.'" The existence of the sin of pride creates a constant warfare between the immanent Deity who fills the world and the possessor of pride. Pride attempts to oust this Deity, but is conquered and laid low by it. The Shechinah accordingly "mourns" over its victim.⁽¹⁾

Genesis Rabba xlvii. 6 alludes to Abraham speaking in companion-like manner with the Shechinah. The angels come to engage Abraham in conversation with them. "No," says he, "let me first take leave of the Shechinah who is greater than either of us." Here the

Shechinah is represented as in the world: Abraham holds communion with the omnipresent Deity. Genesis Rabba xlviii. 9 speaks of "the Shechinah waiting for them" (in allusion to the three men coming to visit Abraham in Genesis xviii. 2).⁽²⁾ Exodus Rabba ii. 5 speaks of the Shechinah as being inside the burning bush and speaking with Moses. This adoption of the bush as the meeting-place between Moses and the Shechinah is intended, says the Midrash, to teach mankind "that no spot on earth is unoccupied by the Shechinah, not even a bush." This is a clear enunciation of the doctrine of God's Immanence in the universe.

Numbers Rabba v. 1, in a dissertation on the verse "Cut ye not off the tribe of the families of the Kohathites from among the Levites" (Numbers iv. 18), speaks of the Shechinah as בְּנֵי קֹהַת, "attacking them" (the Kohathites). The Kohathites in their over-zeal to carry the Ark exceeded the bounds of mutual self-respect. This was sin for which punishment was certain. There is an inevitable collision between sinfulness and God who fills all space.*

Deuteronomy Rabba i. 17 has the following: "When the enemy came to lay Jerusalem waste there were in Jerusalem sixty myriads of demons. They were stationed at the entrance to the Temple and ready to attack the invaders. But when they saw that the Shechinah looked on in silence (and made no attempt to defend the holy House) they gave way before the enemy and allowed them a free entry." Here is the Personified Shechinah whose abode and home was the Temple. The Shechinah here, as in numerous passages, is a term for the Immanence of God in the Temple.⁽³⁾

Closely associated with the foregoing is the Midrash Rabba of Lamentations (Introduction 25), where there

* See, further on, chapter on relation between Shechinah and Sin.

is a curious representation of the Shechinah dwelling three and a half years on the Mount of Olives, with the object of inducing the Israelites to repent. But in vain. The Shechinah in despair exclaims, "I will go and return to my place" (Hosea v. 15). It is concerning that hour that it is said, "Give glory to the Lord your God, before He cause darkness" (Jeremiah xiii. 16). Darkness came in the shape of the ruin of the Temple and Holy City. The Shechinah "returning to its place" expresses the fact of the immanent God of the Temple abandoning it. Hence its ruin. The introduction of the figure of "darkness" shows, as was said before, the common portrayal of the Shechinah as material light.

But perhaps the finest personification of the Shechinah as the immanent God of Jerusalem and the Temple is to be found in the Introduction to Lamentations Rabba xxv. (also found in a shorter and more prosaic form in T. B. Rosh Hashana 31a, and in Aboth De R. Nathan, chap. xxxiv.): "The Shechinah made ten journeys :

- (1) From cherub to cherub.
- (2) From cherub to the threshold of the House.
- (3) From the threshold of the House to the Cherubim.
- (4) From the Cherubim to the Eastern Gate.
- (5) From the Eastern Gate to the Court.
- (6) From the Court to the roof.
- (7) From the roof to the Altar.
- (8) From the Altar to the wall.
- (9) From the wall to the city.
- (10) From the city to the Mount of Olives. . . ."

R. Aḥa said it may be likened unto an earthly monarch who one day went out of his palace in great

anger. Every now and then he returned to the palace, and embracing its walls and its pillars he would say tearfully, "Hail! O beloved palace of mine; Hail! O house of my sovereignty; Hail! O house of my glory; Peace to thee from now and evermore!" Even so was it with the Shechinah. When the Shechinah departed from the Holy Temple it kept returning at intervals, embracing and kissing its hallowed walls and pillars, and bitterly weeping, it kept exclaiming, "Peace to thee, my hallowed shrine! Peace to thee! O abiding place of my sovereign power; Peace to thee! O residence of my glory; Peace to thee from now and for ever more."

Mechilta on בָשְׁלָחַ, edit. Friedmann, p. 24 (same in T. B. Soṭah 15a, Tanḥuma and Rabba on בָשְׁלָחַ, and reproduced in Yalkut *ad loc.*) speaks of the Shechinah as being engaged in the burial rites of Moses. But here, as very often, Shechinah may be merely another expression for God. Still, it is not far-fetched to interpret it as alluding to the Immanence of God. Moses was so saturated with the Divine presence that the latter even remained with him intact at his death. According to Tanḥuma on וְאַתָּה תֵּצֵא the Shechinah ever "walked" on the right hand of Moses (based on Isaiah lxiii. 12). This is another way of showing Moses' ceaseless Divine environment. And this remained until the last rites connected with his burial had been completed.

Yalkut on Numbers iii. 15 tells of the Shechinah walking in front of Moses (at the time of the numbering of the people) and saying to him, "There are so-and-so many children [of the tribe of Levi] in this tent."

Sifri on בְּהִלְלָחַ Numbers x. 33, "And the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord went before them in the three days' journey, to search out a resting-place for them," declares that this is an allusion to the Shechinah which

walked before the Israelites in their march, clearing and safe-guarding the road for them. The Shechinah is likened to an אַנְשִׁיקָה, a king's representative lieutenant, who is charged with making all necessary preparations for the royal suite.⁽⁴⁾

The following illustrations show how the Shechinah, strongly personified, is used as an interchangeable term with "God," expressing Divine Immanence.

Frequently where one passage in Rabbinic literature has the word "Shechinah," a parallel passage somewhere else uses the term "God." And more than this. Frequently the two terms are used indiscriminately in one and the same passage.

First may be given passages which deal with God's universality, His filling the world.

T. B. Sanhedrin 39a. The passage commencing בָּרוּךְ הוּא נוֹפֵר לְדָבָר גִּמְלִיאֵל. R. Gamliel is asked by an infidel how many Shechinah are there in existence, seeing that, according to the Jews' belief, wherever ten men are gathered together there the Shechinah is.⁽⁵⁾ Gamliel's reply is to the effect that the Shechinah is God, who is everywhere. There is one and one only sun, which lights up every nook and corner of the universe. How much more so is it the case, that the one only God makes His presence known and felt everywhere.

T. B. Baba Bathra 25a. "How do you know that the Shechinah is everywhere?" The answer is derived in characteristic Talmudic fashion from Zechariah ii. 3, "And, behold, the angel that talked with me went forth, and another angel went out to meet him" (see Rashi Baba Bathra 25a). A longer and more fanciful form of the same idea, is the one subjoined to it. God's messengers are not as man's. When the latter have executed their message, they have to return to the sender and inform him of the fact. But God's messengers need not

return to their sender. He is accessible to them in whatever spot they may chance to go (quoted also in Mechilta on נב). Genesis Rabba lxviii. 9 (and to be found *passim* in Rabbinic literature, as in Philo), says, "Why is God called 'place'? Because He is the place of the world, and the world is not His place." Similarly, "Why is God called 'a dwelling-place' (Psalm xc. 1)? Because He is the dwelling-place of the world, and the world is not His dwelling-place." The relations between God and the world, are quaintly compared with those subsisting between the horse and its rider. The horse is subservient to the rider and not *vice versa*.* So the world is subservient to God. God is upon it, and in it, and moulds it as He wills. This is a very fine dictum of the Rabbins on the world as spirit. If all these sayings are compared with a statement like, "There is no spot on earth unoccupied by the Shechinah," it is clear that the Immanence of God is identical with the Immanence of the Shechinah.

Another interesting view of the foregoing is that of T. B. Berachoth 10a (given in slightly altered form in Leviticus Rabba iv. 8).⁽⁶⁾ It takes the form of a comparison between God and the soul. Just as the soul fills the body, so God fills the world.[†] Just as the

* i.e. The rider is dependent upon the horse for whatever he wants to do, and yet he is greater than the horse; any success that attends his errand is due to him and not to the horse; in the last resort it is he that holds the horse; the horse does not hold him. He far transcends it.

† This analogy between God and the soul has a larger import than would at first thought appear. It really touches the root-problem of Immanence. It is true that the soul fills the body, but only in the sense that its energies flow through the body. But in reality it far transcends the body. It is not *inside* the body in any physical sense. The body is merely its organ and its instrument. Exactly so with God and the world. The traces of Divine action are everywhere. But there are spheres of Divine action which transcend the limits of the universe. The Immanence of God is accordingly not opposed to the idea of the Transcendence of God. Unless we admit this, we land ourselves in Pantheism. God is not coterminous with the universe as Pantheism would say. He is in the universe and above it, at one and the same time. This Rabbinic analogy between God and the soul has thus a true philosophical bearing, although couched in the usual childlike language of the Rabbins.

soul bears the body, so God endures the world. Just as the soul sees but is not seen, so God sees but is unseen. Just as the soul feeds the body (*i.e.* spiritually, intellectually) so God gives food to the world.

Other forms of the same idea are the following: Song of Songs Rabbi i. "The throne of God exerts its sway from world's end to world's end." A truly poetic description of Omnipresence.* Song of Songs Rabba iii. 8 : comparison of the Shechinah to a cave by the Sea. The sea rushes into the cave, filling it, but the sea is just as full as before. So the Shechinah pervades the Tabernacle, or the Temple, but yet is quite as immanent, all-pervasive in the world at large.

Deuteronomy Rabba ii. 10, God is both far and near. Far, because the distance of earth to heaven is "a five hundred years' journey." Near, because when man utters or even meditates a prayer, God is at hand to hear it, as it is said, "O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."⁽⁷⁾ (Psalm lxv. 2). As the commentary מות נחינה בואה אצל עד = He that prays approximates to God, God is

* A more common designation of the "Throne" in Rabbinic literature as well as in the Jewish Liturgy is "Kissé Ha-Kabod." "The throne of Glory," the "glory" being a synonym for Shechinah, the omnipresent manifestation of God. In T. B. Haggigah 12b and 13a there is a considerable amount of matter on this point, the pivot on which it rests being Psalm lxxxix. 14, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before Thy face." All these ideas of justice, throne, mercy, truth, face, figure so pre-eminently in the mediæval Kabbalah! There is to be found within the large domain of the Rabbinic writings, a higher and a lower, a more spiritual and a more material line of thought about the Throne. Thus in T. B. Sabbath 88b when Moses ascends the mount to receive the tables of stone, the angels object; whereupon God tells Moses to take a firm stand by holding on to the throne. This is a very materialistic conception. On the other hand, the saying of R. Eliezer (in Sabbath 152b) about the souls of the righteous being concealed under the throne, certainly sounds a high spiritual note. There is a fine remark in the Zohar (on Genesis xlvi. 27), based on a similar idea to be found in the Talmud) about the likeness of Jacob being engraven on the throne. This is a beautiful piece of mystical teaching. The oneness of man and Deity which is the result of the highest communion between man and God, could not be more poetically summarised! See also Kimhi on Isaiah ix. 13,—one of the rare instances of a mystical quotation by Kimhi.

at his side ; He is with him. If this is so, in spite of God's immeasurable distance from earth, the remark can only be plausibly interpreted in the sense of the Divine Immanence in man. When man prays, he arouses the Divine element that is imbedded in him, that is part of his natural constitution.

Ruth Rabba v. 4 speaks of the saints as dwelling "not in the shadow of the morning, nor in the shadow of the wings of the north, nor of the wings of the sun of Chayott, or Cherubim, or Seraphim, but only in the shadow of Him through whose word the world was." It is a quaint picture of God as overshadowing, brooding over, the universe ; and the saints nestle within the sphere of this Divine world-embrace.

An important Rabbinic idea found in different forms in many places in Talmud and Midrashim, is to the effect that the Divine voice at Sinai came to each one "אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם" according to the comprehension of each.⁽⁸⁾ This is a commentary on the Psalmist's expression (xxix. 4), "The voice of the Lord is powerful." It was not the outwardly audible voice of God, for the universe would be unable to endure this. It was the inner voice as each one comprehended it. At the time of the Revelation on Sinai every man felt a Voice *within* him—a Voice which gave him the counsel which best answered his own needs. We have here, a very fine attempt on the part of our ancient teachers, to strip the Biblical account of the Revelation of its materialistic dress, and to spiritualise the whole episode. The God of Sinai was the sacred Divine Voice *within* as well as *without* man.*

* I am aware that this interpretation is open to question. I find much support, however, from the way in which the Midrashim attribute the origin of the prophetic power among Israelites to the fact of their having received the Voice at Sinai (see particularly Exodus Rabba xxviii. 6). It shows that accompanying and corresponding to the "outwardness" of the Voice, there must have been an "inwardness" in the hearers.

An interesting instance of how the Rabbins actually deduced a series of important ceremonial laws, from the fact of God's omnipresence, is given in the Sifri on ני תצא, “For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp”—“hence we learn [says Sifri] that man may not read the ‘shema’ inside a wash-house, nor may he enter a bath if he has Phylacteries or Hebrew books in his hands.” Although God is everywhere, the emblems which proclaim His holiness must not intermingle with impure agencies.⁽⁹⁾

A similar instance to the aforesaid is that of T. B. Kiddushin 31a (repeated in Yalkut on Isaiah vi.), “Man is prohibited from walking four cubits with a proud mien, because it is said, ‘The whole earth is full of His glory.’” The sin of pride amounts to a denial of God’s Immanence in the world.⁽¹⁰⁾ R. Huna in the same passage relates that he never walked four cubits with uncovered head because he recognised that the Shechinah was above his head. The “Shechinah” is here an equivalent to the Immanent Deity. R. Isaac says in the same connexion, “He who sins in secret acts as though he were pressing against the feet of the Shechinah.” The underlying idea of the latter passage is that the immanent God permeates all space. When sin comes on the scene it naturally collides with this Divinity. The sinner is thus the antithesis to the immanent God.

The Yalkut on Jeremiah chap. xxiii. v. 24, “Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, etc.,” . . . illustrates God’s Immanence in the universe by the figure of an architect who planned a city full of caves and subterranean passages. After a time misfortune befell the citizens, and they hurried to deposit secretly what valuables they possessed inside these dark places. Whereupon, the architect said,

"You may strive to hide your possessions as you will, from one another or from the enemy. But you can hide naught from me. For I have planned not only the city, but also the secret hiding-places." ⁽¹¹⁾ *

To the preceding instances which have been intended to show what the Rabbins thought on the fact of God's Immanence (whether by the usage of the term "God" or "Shechinah," both being interchangeable), I add the following series of quotations which deal with His immanent activity in man and the world.

Genesis Rabba xi. 11, "God on the seventh day ceased from the creation of His world, but not from the creation of good and evil men."

Genesis Rabba viii. 13, "God blesses bridegrooms. He adorns brides, He visits the sick, He buries the dead." ⁽¹²⁾ This is a graphic way of showing God's close participation in the affairs of man. He is with us in our joy, as He is with us in our pain and sorrow.

Genesis Rabba xlix. 3, "No day passes unless God is מחדש הילנה בב' ד' של מעלה, i.e. introduces a new law in the Beth Din of Above. The Rabbins were fond of representing God as presiding over a court composed of angels. The drift of the saying would therefore seem to be, that God is daily creating new rules and regulations for the guidance of mankind. No day but reveals the activity of God's finger in mundane events. This activity at times takes on almost a humorous turn. Because God, or rather, because His Shechinah is so beneficently imbedded in man and the world,—He is the universal marriage-maker. It can be no other than the Divine hand which will bring man and woman together in the bonds of love, although separated from one another by immeasurable distances. What a bizarre

* i.e. Just as an architect may be said to be immanent in his sketches and plans, or just as a poet is immanent in his poems.

statement is the following, although very true to experience: אֲפִילוּ מִתּוֹ אֶחָד הַקְבִּיחָה מִבְיאָן וּמִזְוֹגָן (Genesis Rabba lxv. 2). And for the same reason the successes and failures of men are the results of the Divine plans brought to bear unremittingly upon the things of the world.⁽¹³⁾ “God is engaged in making ladders upon which one man climbs to success, but down which another descends to failure” (Genesis Rabba lxviii. 4). Leviticus Rabba xxvii. 5 speaks of God’s ceaseless activity in the interests of the wronged and persecuted. Commenting on Ecclesiastes iii. 15 וְהַלְדִים יַבְקֵשׁ אֶת נְזֹفָה, it adduces several Biblical examples of Divine interference for the sake of the persecuted, no matter whether the latter be a worthy or unworthy man.⁽¹⁴⁾

Genesis Rabba lxxvii. i. tells how God allows His beneficent work to be anticipated by good men. This is a similar idea to God causing the Shechinah to rest upon men possessed of certain qualifications. The work of good men is a phase of God’s immanent beneficent activity in the world.⁽¹⁵⁾

A favourite Rabbinic expression is that of man, under certain circumstances, being “a co-worker with God in the work of creation.” The Mechilta on יִתְרו ascribed this function to Moses in his judicial capacity.⁽¹⁶⁾ The basic idea is that of God’s immanent activity in the world. When man adds his quota of usefulness he *ipso facto* becomes a co-worker with God. The sum of Divine blessedness in the universe is increased.

A quaint portrayal of God’s immanent activity in nature is the following: “Man can only fashion an image on dry land, but God can do so in water also. When man builds a dwelling, he can only place the dwellers in the upper and lower stories: but God can place them in the hollow also. . . .”

But the boldest and most pictorial representation of

these same immanent ideas of Divine activity is that of Yalkut on Exodus xxxi., where the Almighty is represented as declaring, "From the day of the world's creation even unto this hour I sit upon the Throne of my Glory, spending one-third of the day in study of Torah, the other third in executing justice, and the last third in practising benevolence and giving sustenance to all mundane creatures." If this passage means anything at all, it alludes to the Divine implanting of these virtues in the hearts of mankind. God's day is eternity, His throne is the universe. The study of the Torah is the emblem of righteousness, truth. The Divine tendencies making for righteousness, truth, benevolence are ingrained in the world; they are the traces of God, which are part and parcel of the texture of the human soul.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

(1) In Aboth De R. Nathan, chap. xxxvi., it is said, "All the time that the Israelites are immersed in immorality (*מִשְׁמָרֶת*) the Shechinah keeps away from them, as it is said, 'That He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee' (Deut. xxiii. 14)." Here the Deity is the personified Shechinah, and there is the antithesis between Shechinah and sin.

(2) In Genesis Rabba xlviii. 1 on the passage Genesis xviii. 1, the Shechinah stands and allows Abraham to be seated.

(3) We treat of this subject further on.

(4) In his edition of the Sifri, Friedmann has an interesting note on *וְאַתָּה קָרֵב*. It = ante Cæsar.

(5) That the Shechinah resides in the company of ten, is in T. B. Berachoth 6a.

(6) See also for same, Deuteronomy Rabba ii. 37, Tanhuma on *תְּנִזְעָן* (a much curtailed form).

(7) Exodus Rabba xxi. 4 has a long excursus on this verse from Psalm lxy. It gives some beautifully poetic sentiments on Prayer.

(8) It is found in the Mechilta, Tanhuma, Pesikta De R'Kahana, and Yalkut in their comments on Exodus xix. and xx. (the Revelation on Sinai), as well as in Exodus Rabba v. 9 and xxix. 1. In Exodus Rabba xxxiv. 1 this idea of "*אֱלֹהִים כָּל־כָּלָה*" is elaborated by the remark, "God does

not come to man oppressively, but commensurately with man's power of receiving Him."

(9) A good view of the Rabbinic ideas of ceremonial purity and impurity in conjunction with their ideas of God's omnipresence is to be obtained from T. B. Berachoth 22-25. In Tanhuma on נסן כ' there is a similar combination of ritual ideas, with the teaching of the Divine omnipresence. The Roman emperor asks R. Akiba why God is permitted to work on the Sabbath? Why just as on week-days? He "causes the winds to blow, the clouds to ascend, the rain to fall, the sun to shine, etc." And the answer which Akiba gives is that God dwells in a *רשות ה' יייר* by Himself. No one else is with Him and cannot be, because the whole earth is filled with His glory. Therefore in doing the things He does on the Sabbath, He is merely carrying out the kind of work which the Rabbins call *טלאיל טלאיל*, and *טלאיל* is permitted in a *רשות ה' יייר* on the Sabbath.

(10) The author of the בעל המורות (Jacob Ben Asher, fourteenth century) in his comments on Exodus xvi. 20 has an interesting homiletical remark on the word יְלִמּוּ. Unlike Rashi (who associates it with יְלֵא = worm) he dwells on its connexion with יָרֵם = to be high, i.e. to be proud, haughty. Connecting this again with the passage in Ezekiel x. 4, "Then the Glory of the Lord went up from the Cherub . . ." where the word for "went up" is *עָמַד* [from the same root, and the Rabbinical interpretation refers it to the departing of the Shechinah, see T. B. Rosh Hashana 31a; Lamentations Rabba, Introduction xxv.; Aboth De R. Nathan 34], he dwells on the fact that the haughty man causes the Shechinah to depart, because he as much as belies the existence of the Shechinah. The end of such a man, continues he, in a moralising strain, is that, just like the manna (in Exodus xvi.), he "breeds worms and stinks" (where the same root *עָמַד* is employed).

(11) This Yalkut Midrash seems a reproduction of Tanhuma on נסן (Numbers v. 12).

(12) That God buries the dead is curiously derived by the Rabbins from Deuteronomy xxxiv. 6, "And He buried him in the valley"; the first "He" alludes to God. See T. B. Sotah 9b, 14a.

(13) Cp. Genesis Rabba lxviii. 3, 4, for God as the marriage-maker and the fiasco of the woman who thought to do likewise.

(14) Rashi on Eccles. iii. 15 reproduces this view. God seeks eternally to punish the evil-doer. What advantage has he therefore out of his evil, seeing that in the end he must be caught in the Divine net and receive his retribution?

(15) Exodus Rabba xii. 1 says in a similar sense, "God strengthens the strength of the righteous in order that they should do His will."

(16) Mechilta on רם"ג; T. B. Sanhedrin 7a; T. B. Sabbath 10a.

CHAPTER VIII

(c) THE PERSONIFIED SHECHINAH AS THE IMMANENT GOD IN PALESTINE, THE TEMPLE AND THE SYNAGOGUE

It is only to be expected that the immanent God of the universe should, in the minds of the Rabbins, be in an even truer and more emphatic sense, the immanent God of the Holy Land. And that God should be immanent in Temple and Synagogue, is a doctrine, the foundation of which, is seen in nearly all the more familiar passages of the Bible and the Jewish Prayer Book. The possibility of an unevenness in the distribution of Immanence, or, in other words, the question whether it can feasibly be said, that God is present in any one place in a greater and higher degree than He is present in any other place, is a matter upon which the Rabbins did not stop to think. For, as has been said before, the Rabbins were no philosophers. They spoke from the heart, not from books. They elaborated no systems and laid down no categories. The gems of the Talmud and Midrash make better poetry than philosophy. We can understand on many grounds how, when treating of such themes as God in the Temple or the Synagogue, in the Holy Land and amidst the praises of Israel, these old Rabbinic theologians should assume the mantle of the poet, and give out their message under the halo of the poet's imagination. But yet, although the Rabbins do not seem to have felt any insuperable

inconsistency between God being supremely immanent in the Temple, Palestine, etc., and His Immanence in the universe generally, there can be no question that they noted the difficulty. This can be seen from many passages. Genesis Rabba iii. 9 (and more fully in Numbers Rabba xiii. 6, also quoted in brief in Yalkut on טומין, Tanhuma on פקודי, and T. B. Sabbath 87b)* says that from the first day of creation, God was desirous of dwelling, not above but within the universe (בתחור). But He did not do so until the Tabernacle was erected. Then the Shechinah rested within it, and God said, "Let it be written that this day the world was created." "And," continues the foregoing passage, "that day (on which the Tabernacle was erected and consecrated) was, among other things, ראשן לשכינה, i.e. the First day of the Shechinah's existence in the universe."^{a)} The basic idea here seems to be, that God's Immanence in the Tabernacle was, so to speak, the origin, source, and fount of His Immanence in the world. The world received this privilege through the Tabernacle.

A passage of a kindred nature but of another trend is that of Exodus Rabba xxxiv. 1 : "When God said unto Moses, 'Make me a tabernacle,' he (Moses) began to wonder, and exclaimed, 'God's Glory fills the upper and lower worlds, how can a tabernacle suffice to hold Him ?' And more than this, Moses saw, by prophetic inspiration, that Solomon would one day build a Temple more spacious than the Tabernacle, and yet Solomon would have to exclaim, 'Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee ; how much less this house that I have builded ?' 'If Solomon's Temple was too small, will not my tabernacle be too small ?' . . . Then God replied, 'Your thoughts are not as my

* There is much to the same effect also in Pesikta Rabbati.

thoughts. . . . I can come down if I so will, and make the Shechinah abide in the smallest possible compass, even in a space of one cubit by one cubit.' " (1^a) Numbers Rabba xii. 3 adds the following significant remark : " God who dwells in the שְׁחוּן שֶׁל עָלָם secret recesses of the universe, who sees and is not seen, He is לְלֹעַג, בְּצִלּוֹנוּ נְתַאֲרוּה, i.e. He desires to dwell in our shadow." If there is any possible difficulty in reconciling the fact of God's immanence in the small space of the Tabernacle or Temple with the fact of His Immanence in the world at large, the Rabbins forestalled and explained it by saying that it is God's will that it should be so.

Another quaint attempt to solve the difficulty is that of a passage in Sifri on **עֲקָב**. The question is there asked, " Does God seek the welfare of Palestine only ? Does He not seek the welfare of the lands as well ? " And the reply given is as follows : " Speaking from a human standpoint, God only seeks the welfare of Palestine ; and as a consequence of His seeking Palestine's welfare, He also seeks that of all other lands with it." (2)

From this point of view, then, God's Immanence in the universe generally, is a corollary of His Immanence in the Holy Land. The same Midrash dwells in a similar strain, on the relation between Divine Immanence in Israel and in all Mankind. The latter is a favour granted as a consequence of the former. And so with the Temple in Jerusalem and all other places. It is said of the former, " And mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually" (1 Kings ix. 3). Yet, is it not also said, " The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth" (Zechariah iv. 10) ? But the latter is a favour granted in consequence of the former.⁽³⁾

There is no philosophic reasoning here. It is a good specimen of the Rabbinical style of exegesis.

Yet another striking passage on God's Immanence in the Temple and, as a consequence of this, in the universe generally, is to be found in Exodus Rabba ii. 2, "Until the Temple was destroyed the Shechinah abode in it; after its destruction the Shechinah departed and ascended up to heaven, as it is said, 'The Lord hath established His throne in the heavens' (Psalm ciii. 19)." R. Eliezer, however, said that the Shechinah never left the Western Wall, as it is said, "And mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually" (1 Kings ix. 3), and as it is further said, "I cried unto the Lord with my voice, and He heard me out of His holy hill" (Psalm iii. 4); although it is in ruins it is nevertheless the holy hill, the holiness remains still. What does Cyrus say? He says, "And build the house of the Lord God of Israel, He is the God which is in Jerusalem" (Ezra i. 3). Cyrus hereby implies that although the Holy City was as yet in ruins, nevertheless God was there still. R. Aḥa said that the Shechinah never departed from the Western Wall, as it is said, "Behold, He standeth behind our wall" (Song of Songs ii. 9), and it is further written, "His eyes behold, His eyelids try, the children of men" (Psalm xi. 4). R. Yannai said although His Shechinah is in heaven, nevertheless His eyes behold, His eyelids try, the children of men."⁽⁴⁾

Thus we have three different opinions:—

(1) That after the fall of the Temple the Shechinah left the universe entirely.

(2) That it abode in the Western Wall, *i.e.* that it was still, so to speak, hovering round the spot once so sacred, but went no farther.⁽⁵⁾

(3) That it became the possession of the whole world. The latter is the broad view of R. Yannai, when he says that the Heavenly Shechinah still tries and proves the children of men. God's Immanence, which

was concentrated in the Holy House, disseminated itself universally after the House was no more.

According to a passage in Numbers Rabba i. 3, this concentration of the Shechinah in the Temple was a boon to mankind, saving them from death.⁽⁶⁾ R. Joshua, the son of Levi, said, "that if the nations only knew of what benefit the Tabernacle and Temple have been to them, they would surround them with impenetrable approaches⁽⁷⁾ in order to guard them all the more safely. And why so? Because, before the erection of the Tabernacle, the Word ('Dibbur') used to enter the homes of the nations, and they were frightened to death. . . . And so it was before the erection of the Temple. . . ."⁽⁸⁾

The Tanhuma on תרומת follows up this with the remark: "Before the Temple was built the world stood upon a throne of two legs; but with the erection of the Temple the universe received its proper and permanent basis (נַחֲבָדָם דְּעִוָּלָם)." The meaning of this curious saying probably is, that the world without God immanent in it, is like a chair which has only two legs to stand on—a useless chair. This immanent God only reached the world *via* the Tabernacle or Temple.

A passage in the Introduction to Lamentations Rabba, speaks of God weeping at seeing the destruction of the Temple. God had previously said, "All the while that I dwell therein the nations will be unable to enter it." At His withdrawal the nations entered, and then God said, "I have no longer an abode in the earth, and my Shechinah shall therefore depart to its original seat. . . . Woe is me! What have I done? It was for Israel's sake that I caused my Shechinah to dwell below, but now (that I have seen their unworthiness and sin) I have returned to my heavenly home." The ideas in this passage are:—(1) That in Rabbinic usage,

not only are God and Shechinah interchangeable terms, but that Shechinah is often spoken of as one of the qualities or possessions of the Deity; thus the latter speaks of "My Shechinah." (2) The Shechinah is a boon given to the world only because of Israel. The world enjoys the Divine Immanence only through the original virtue of Israel.⁽⁹⁾

A far more concise statement than any yet given concerning God's Immanence in Palestine is found in T. B. Yebamoth 105b (reproduced in Yalkut on 1 Kings viii.), to the effect that "he who prays must direct his eyes below but his heart above."⁽¹⁰⁾

The eyes must be below, because God is immanent in Palestine, as proved from 1 Kings ix. 3, "And mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." The heart must be above, because God is above, as it is written (Lam. of Jeremiah iii. 41), "Let us lift up our hearts with our hands unto God in the heavens." The correct prayerful attitude is therefore the recognition of God as everywhere, as filling all space from heaven to earth.*

The Immanence of God in the Synagogue is a kindred theme to the preceding, and is treated in Rabbinic literature by very much the same methods. There is one long passage in T. B. Berachoth (6 and 7) where the subject figures very prominently. Its main ideas briefly summed up are: (1) God is in the synagogue (derived from the Psalm lxxxii. 1, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty"); (2) when God does not find ten males in the synagogue He is angry; (3) God prays, and the synagogue is His house of prayer (derived from Isaiah lvi. 7, "Even

* And it is another illustration of the difference between Immanence and Pantheism. In saying that man should look below when praying, the Rabbins were careful to add the qualification that "the heart must look above." God, said they rightly, is immanent but transcendent.

them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer”⁽¹¹⁾; * (4) as a corollary of the preceding, the prayer of man is only heard when prayed in synagogue.^(11a)

A passage in Numbers Rabba xi. 2 represents God as skipping (פָּדַל) from synagogue to synagogue in order to bless Israel.⁽¹²⁾ The same passage a little further on speaks of God’s glory (a synonym for Shechinah as we shall see later) as standing in the synagogue at the time when the Israelites enter it in order to read the “Shema.” And more than this. At the time when the priests in synagogue pronounce their benediction, God stands at the back of them. He is visible from between the shoulders and fingers of the priests.

A variant of the last passage occurs in Deuteronomy Rabba vii. 2, based on Proverbs viii. 34. God is present at the door of the synagogue, and counts the steps of the worshipper as he wends his way to the holy house, giving him a separate reward for each additional step that he takes. When man leaves the synagogue he has not only had the merit of seeing the “Face” of the Shechinah, but bears away also ever so many blessings.⁽¹³⁾

A passage in Yalkut on Ezekiel i. gives some quaint mathematical figures regarding the distance of God from the earth, and yet God hears prayers in the synagogue. “From earth to the firmament is a distance of five

* For a very fine poetic-philosophic description of the Shechinah in the Holy Land, see the *Kusari* of Jehuda Ha-Levi, chap. ii. 14-18. After dwelling on the meaning of such terms as “Shechinah,” “Glory of God,” “Angel of God,” etc., and their connexion with prophets and prophecy (בְּרִים נִאָמָן בְּלֵין שְׁם אֶל הַבְּאוֹרָה), “these are names which apply to things seen by the prophets”), the author proceeds to show how it was that the immanence of God in Palestine had the inevitable result of causing that country to be the first exclusive land for the use of prophecy. The way in which he connects all three ideas—Palestine, Shechinah, Prophecy—is most interesting. The Shechinah, he says, which existed in the first Temple was the means by which all Israelites who had the necessary qualifications of mind and soul attained the degree of prophecy (הִיא כָּל מִזְמָרָה כָּל תְּבוּנָה כָּל חֲכָמָה).

hundred years' travel. The distance from one extremity of the firmament to the other, is another five hundred years' travel. And yet God, though above these, is at the side of the Israelite when he whispers a prayer into His ear in synagogue.”⁽¹⁴⁾

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

(1) This was one of the ten “Firsts” for which that day was celebrated (“עשור עשרות נטל אתנו הים יכו”).

(1a) The Tanhuma on *בָּא* has a slightly different version. When God tells Moses to build the Tabernacle, He admits that He has His real Tabernacle above, as it is said, *כִּי כְּבוֹד מִרְאַת קְדוּשָׁתִינוּ* (Jeremiah xvii. 12), and “*וְהַנִּיל קָרֵשׁ וּנוּ*” (Habakkuk ii. 20), etc.; but His object is to show His love for Israel: “For the sake of my love for you I will leave the upper Temple (*בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַעֲלִילִין*), and will come down and dwell among you.”

A shorter form, based on the same version as that of Exodus Rabba xxxiv. 1 given above, is to be found in the Pesikta Rabbati and Pesikta De R. Kahana on Exodus xxv. 8. It is also quoted in Yalkut on Psalm xcii.

(2) The Mechilta, p. 1 (Friedmann), has the following: “The Shechinah does not reveal itself outside Palestine (*בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרְץ*), as it is said, ‘And Jonah arose to flee to Tarshish’ (Jonah i. 3). Could he then flee from God? Is it not said, ‘Whither shall I go from Thy spirit . . . ? if I ascend to heaven Thou art there, etc. etc.’ Also, ‘They are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth’ (Zechariah iv. 10). Also, ‘The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good’ (Prov. xv. 3). Also, ‘Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hands take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down . . . ’ (Amos ix. 2-4). Also, ‘There is no darkness nor shadow of death, where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves’ (Job xxxiv. 22). But what Jonah said was this: ‘I will go outside Palestine, because there the Shechinah does not reveal itself . . . ?’ One notices in this striking passage that an antithesis is drawn between God and Shechinah. The latter is everywhere, but the former only shows itself in the Holy Land.

(3) Friedmann points out here that a better reading is *בְּשָׁבֵל וְרִישָׁה* (not *בְּשָׁנֵן וְרִישָׁה*).

(4) It is hard to see how R. Aha can prove that the Shechinah never left the Western Wall by reference to the verse, “His eyes behold, His eyelids try, the children of men” (Psalm xi. 4). But possibly the idea of the Shechinah’s constant presence at the Western Wall is to be taken as synonymous with its constant presence in the world in general. Though God is no more in the Temple, He is nevertheless outside it, i.e.

in the world where all men are: His eyes see and try all men. This dictum of R. Aha would then agree with that of R. Yannai. The latter says distinctly: "Although He appears to have withdrawn His Shechinah," i.e. from the world, still it is there.

(5) These two opinions are reproduced in a passage of the *Yalkut* on 1 Kings viii. "R. Samuel b. Nahmeni said that until the Temple was destroyed, the Shechinah abode in the *לֹאָה*. After it was destroyed it departed to heaven. R. Eliezer b. Pedath said whether it is destroyed or not destroyed, the Shechinah does not stir from the spot, as it is said, 'And mine eyes and my heart shall be there perpetually.'

(6) This is found also in *Tanhuma* on *וְיַעֲשֵׂה*.

(7) The Midrashic word used here is *בָּסָרִים*, which the author of the commentary *בְּמִזְרָחָה כְּבָנָה*, says, means *בָּנוֹת בָּנָה*, "balconies in buildings." Most probably it is a Hebraised plural of the Latin "castra" = camp.

(8) The *Tanhuma* derives these ideas from certain passages in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of his Temple. The idea of being terrified by the Shechinah, or, as here, by the "Dibbur," is of frequent occurrence. For several instances of this, see T. B. Sabbath 88b.

(9) In the *Yalkut* on Lamentations ii. God is represented as sitting in the Temple while the flames encircle it. He is likened to a human king whose place has been set on fire by the enemy. He sits inside it so as not to show any fear or weakness to the enemy, until at last, at the instigation of his friends, he takes his departure.

(10) The author of this statement in T. B. *Yebamoth* 105b is R. Hiya, who was a Palestinian Amora. It is easy to infer, therefore, that when he speaks of directing the eyes downwards during prayer, he must mean Palestine.

(11) "It is not said in the house of their prayer (*מִשְׁבָּרָה*), but in the house of my prayer (*מִלְּבָדָה*). Whence we learn that God prays."

(11a) That prayer is only heard when prayed in synagogue, is the opinion of Abba Benjamin in T. B. *Berachoth* 6a. It is, of course, not universally accepted by the Rabbins.

(12) This idea of God "skipping from synagogue to synagogue" is found also in Song of Songs Rabba ii. on verse *מִלְּבָדָה עַל חֶרְמוֹן*.

(13) According to a passage in Exodus Rabba xxi. 4, the angels take the prayers of the Israelites in synagogues and weave them into a crown for the head of God.

(14) There are seven heavens according to Rabbinic theology. The phrase *עִזִּים כָּל וְקִיעָּם* = (literally) "thickness of each firmament." I have translated it by "the distance from one extremity to the other," as thickness would be unintelligible. The seven heavens are laid in separate strata, one above another. The thickness of each stratum is a matter of five hundred years' travel. The distance intervening between this stratum and the next above it, is again a matter of five hundred years' travel.

With this saying cp. Ben Sira, "The prayer of the humble pierces the clouds" (xxxv. 17).

CHAPTER IX

(D) THE PERSONIFIED SHECHINAH AS THE IMMANENT GOD IN ISRAEL

PERHAPS the finest and most poetic expressions on Divine Immanence to be found anywhere in the pages of Rabbinic literature, are those which speak of God's ever-constant presence in the midst of Israel. This can be accounted for by the fact, that the subject appealed to the old Jewish teachers in a far more personal sense than did the other questions regarding Immanence. The Rabbinical epoch was a time of Jewish political subjection. Judea was under the heel of Rome. The one hope of the Jew, which absorbed and eclipsed all his other hopes, was for the speedy advent of a redemption from all these troubles. And underlying that hope, and fomenting it, was the innate confidence in the Immanence of God in Israel. All those Biblical passages which speak of God as walking in the midst of Israel's camp, as dwelling in the midst of the praises of Israel, as being ever-mindful of Israel's troubles, and of watching over Israel with the love and solicitude with which a father watches over and guards his own son, were interpreted in a strictly literal and realistic sense. If joy befell them, God was to be praised for having brought it about. If sorrow, then God had not done it. It was the just and deserved retribution for their failure to realise the highest and best. God was the

ever-present and ever-near One. He was all love and all forgiveness, and would “never willingly afflict nor grieve the children of men.”

The best-known of all the Rabbinic sayings on this head, is that which speaks of the Deity following the Israelites whithersoever they happened to be exiled. It is found with great frequency, the versions differing from one another in wording, but the meaning and purport always the same. The commonest version is that of T. B. Megillah 29a : “Come and see how beloved are the Israelites before God ; for wherever they went into exile the Shechinah followed them. When they were exiled to Egypt, the Shechinah followed them, as it is said, ‘Did I plainly reveal myself to thy father’s house when they were in Egypt?’ (1 Samuel ii. 27). In Babylon the Shechinah was with them, as it is said, ‘For your sake have I [been] sent to Babylon’ (Isaiah xlivi. 14).⁽¹⁾ And when, in the future, Israel will be redeemed, the Shechinah will then be with them, as it is said, ‘The Lord thy God will turn thy captivity’⁽²⁾ (Deut. xxx. 3), i.e. God will return with thy captivity.” A longer and fuller passage is Exodus Rabba xv. 16, which fills up the intermediate experiences of Israel between the Babylonian Captivity and the redemption of the future. God was with Israel in their Persian and Median exile, and in their Grecian and Roman exile. And, concludes the Midrash, it was this un-failing presence of God in their banishment and subjugation that enabled them to rise superior to their conquerors and prepare themselves for the triumph of a great future yet to come.⁽³⁾ A parallel passage in Numbers Rabba vii. 10 gives the variant reading “the Shechinah is with them in their dispersion.” This is an important addition. God is present among scattered Israel, in Israel of to-day. This is certainly an improve-

ment on the original idea. A parallel passage in the Mechilta⁽⁴⁾ (edit. Friedmann, p. 16) has the following important addition, אָמַרְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְפָנֵי הָעָם בֶּן־פְּדִית, “The Israelites (at the time of their deliverance from trouble) used to say unto God, ‘Thou hast redeemed thyself.’ ‘So close was the bond riveting Israel to God and, *vice versa*, so fully merged was God in Israel, so complete was the oneness of God and Israel, that in redeeming Israel, God redeemed Himself. Israel was part of God and God was part of Israel.’”⁽⁵⁾ This has all the appearance of paradox, but it is, for all that, an unmistakable and great pronouncement on the Immanence of God in Israel.

All those passages in the Bible which speak of angels exercising guardianship over Israel, whether in a collective or individual sense, are taken by the Rabbins to be an indication of the ever-constant presence of the Shechinah in time of trial or danger to Israel. This seems to be the meaning of the assertion in Exodus Rabba xxxii. 9, “Wherever an angel is seen, there the Shechinah is seen.” Another form of the same idea is that of Exodus Rabba xxxii. 6, commenting on the verse “The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them” (Psalm xxxiv. 7). It is to the effect that for every precept which a Jew conscientiously performs, he has an angel given him as a recompense. Thus, if he does one “Mitzvah” (“precept”) he receives one angel; if two, then two angels, and so forth. If he performs a multiplicity of precepts then God gives him half of His camp.” The possession of an angel is thus a synonym for the possession of such and such a degree of Divine Immanence. The worthiest man is the man possessed of most angels, i.e. possessed of the highest degree of God’s Immanence. And this is tersely summed up in a sentence of

R. Simeon ben Yohai (Genesis Rabba lxxxvi. 6), “Wherever the pious go, there the Shechinah accompanies them.”*

According to a passage in Numbers Rabba i. 3 (to which allusion was made before in connexion with Divine immanence in the Temple), the ever-presence of God in Israel is an indirect boon to the whole world. “Were it not for Israel (*i.e.* for God’s presence in Israel), the rain would not come down, neither would the sun shine; and in the time to come, when the nations shall see how

* A passage such as this is important, in view of the constantly-made allegation, that the post-exilic literature of the Jews tended in more and more of a deistic direction, keeping God farther and farther away from direct intervention and mingling in the affairs of the world. To bridge over the gulf, it is alleged, the Jews of these times invented (or introduced after borrowing) the notion of angels to act as intermediary agencies between God and the world. In this indirect way God influences the world while being Himself uninfluenced by it. The number of Rabbinic dicta on the subject of angels is so great, and the sayings are so variegated, that it is exceedingly hazardous to attempt to lay down any hard-and-fast doctrine about them, except after a thorough-going study of this large branch of Talmudic and Midrashic literature. One thing is certain even after a superficial acquaintance—and that is, that there is not *one* doctrine but many. Among these many doctrines is the one alluded to here, *viz.* an identification of the functions of an angel with that of the Shechinah. The angel is not the intermediary nor the mediator, but is an emanation of the Divine, a portion of the immanent God in His aspect of protector or patron; and thus more or less an equivalent of Shechinah. The falsity of the random statements usually made about the Rabbinic angelology being merely a device for bridging over the chasm between God and the world, is seen from such a passage as the following (from Genesis Rabba xvii. 2), “R. Samuel b. Nahman said that **מְרָא**: *i.e.* the earning of one’s livelihood, is a greater thing than **נַחֲזָקָה**, *i.e.* redemption from trouble. And why? because the latter is effected by means of an angel, as it is said, ‘The angel that redeemed me from all evil’ (Gen. xlviii. 16), but the former can only be brought about by God Himself, as it is said, ‘Thou openest thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.’” It is quite obvious here, that the difference between the two is not one of fact, but of degree. Redemption by an angel, is not meant to be a different thing from redemption by God, but only a different degree of care or providence exercised by God. Both are aspects of the Divine omnipresent fatherhood, only the one is less intense than the other. It is obvious from this, as from the passages quoted above, that the Rabbins had ideas of varying degrees of intensity as to the immanent providence of God. A man having one or two or three angels given him, means merely the vouchsafing to man of increasing quantities of Godliness, man’s ascent higher and higher in the scale. The Midrash already quoted, has a further allusion to Joshua v. 14, “Nay, but as Captain of the Lord of Hosts am I come.” Joshua’s visitor is an angel, and the Rabbins interpret his words as meaning: “In every place where I am seen, there God is seen.” The angel is thus merely a visible Divine manifestation upon earth, similar to the Shechinah (see Commentary **מְרָא** **מְרָא** *ad loc.*).

God is in Israel, they will all anxiously come to ally themselves with Israel, as it is said, ‘In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you’ (Zech. viii. 23).’

An imaginative Midrash in Lamentations Rabba (Introd. 15) gives us a variant to the idea of the Shechinah accompanying Israel in all the places of his pilgrimage. “When the Israelites were in captivity God used to go round the houses of the nations and listen to what they were saying.⁽⁶⁾ And what did He hear them saying? How the God of Israel had brought retribution upon such wrongdoers as Pharaoh, Sisera, Sennacherib, etc., and how לְעוֹלָם נֶעֱד הוּא, i.e. God is always young.” This latter idea of the unchanging youth of the Deity seems to be a poetic attempt to picture the Immanence of God as far as Israel is concerned. God is with Israel, and ever the same, whether yesterday, or to-day, or in the coming time. An adjoining Midrash (Lam. Rabba, Introd. 16) declares God to be the heart of Israel. A striking illustration of these God-in-Israel ideas is afforded by a passage in the Jerusalem Talmud Berachoth, פ' זרואה (repeated in brief in Deuteronomy Rabba ii. 16). A ship whose passengers consisted of heathens with the exception of one only Jew, was once in great difficulties when in mid-ocean. In the greatest dismay an appeal was made to the Jew to pray to God for help. The Jew prayed and the ship was saved. When the harbour was reached, the passengers, feeling the pangs of hunger badly, asked the Jew to disembark and get them some food. But the latter replied, “Am I not a stranger here as well as you? I do not know this place any

more than you do." To which they replied, "Is a Jew a stranger anywhere? Is not God with you wherever you go? Does not your Bible say, 'For what nation is so great who hath God so nigh unto them?'" (Deut. iv. 7).

Another passage in the Jerusalem Talmud (Ta'anith, chap. ii), quoted also in Yalkut on Joshua v., gives this God-in-Israel idea in the form of God being *וְשָׁנַת שְׁנָתוֹת לְאַרְצָה*, i.e. putting His name into fellowship with Israel. God expressed the fear that Israel might lose his identity by being swallowed up among the nations. To avert this, He merged His name, i.e. Himself, in fellowship with Israel.¹⁷ The parable given in this connexion is curious and interesting. A king once had a key belonging to one of his most cherished palaces. One day fear seized him, lest this key might accidentally become lost. What did he do? He attached it to a chain, thus making it more tangible and its loss more easily perceptible. The case of Israel is analogous. Left to himself, he might have perished unknown. But with God merged in fellowship with him, his eternity is assured.*

* I have already alluded to the mysteriousness with which in several parts of the Bible, the name of God is hedged round. The earliest Kabbalistic and cosmological speculations of the Talmudic teachers arrived at all sorts of mystical conclusions, by means of the combination and permutation of the letters composing the Divine name. So did the Sefer Yetsirah, the Zohar, and other mediæval Kabbalistic productions.

The idea here alluded to, of God and Israel in fellowship with one another, is worthy of note. It occurs in different forms throughout Rabbinic literature. It is worthy of note because of a somewhat similar usage of "fellowship" in the New Testament. The Epistles of St. Paul, which are the earliest sources for an historical picture of the primitive churches, make it clear that the first followers of Christ did not constitute a church in the modern sense, but a fellowship. The group of Jerusalem Christians depicted in Acts ii. is described in verse 42 of that chapter as a *kouperia*, i.e. fellowship. This fellowship seems to have had both a material and a mystical side. The former meant the binding together of men for mutual help, strength, and consolidation (see 1 Corinthians xii. 14-26). The latter seems but an adaptation of the Rabbinic idea of Israel and God being merged in one fellowship. Christ is made to take the place of God. Paul's central idea that "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" has certainly all the appearance of being a piece of teaching for which his Rabbinic

But perhaps the boldest of the many attempts to merge God in Israel is the passage in T. B. Berachoth 6a (quoted also in Yalkut on יונתן) where God is pictured as laying "Tephillin," and the question is asked, "What is inscribed on these Tephillin?" And the answer given is, that there is inscribed upon them the words, "And what one nation in the earth is like Thy people Israel?" The only feasible interpretation of this seems to be, that it is an attempt to draw the closest possible approximation existing between Israel and the Deity. Israel's Tephillin are the symbol of the bond of affection between him and God. God's "Tephillin" are the symbol of the affection between Him and Israel. God is so close to Israel, that He loves to deck Himself with Israel's ornaments. God is in Israel, so that Tephillin on the

upbringing was responsible. Those portions of the descriptions of this fellowship in the New Testament, where the invasion of the Holy Spirit is referred to and the consciousness of the continued presence of Christ (e.g. Matthew xviii. 20; Acts ii. 2-4; 1 Corinthians x. 16, 17; *ibid.* v. 4, etc.), seem an elaboration, for Christian purposes, of the Rabbinical mystical idea of fellowship. See *Mystical Religion*, by Rufus M. Jones, pp. 20, 21.

An instance of the curious teachings (alluded to above), which the Kabbalists deduced, not merely from the permutations of the various letters comprising the Divine name, but also from the various synonyms for the Divine name, occurs in the *סְמִינָת הַשְׁמָה* (Book of Mystery), one of the oldest fragments of the Zohar, which affords a *résumé* of the most elevated teachings of the Zohar: "When a man wishes to address a prayer to God, he may equally invoke either the Holy names of God (יהי, א, ז, etc.) or the ten Spheres, i.e. the Crown, Wisdom, Intelligence, Beauty, Grace, Justice, etc." All the Kabbalists agree on this point, viz. that the ten names of God and the ten Spheres are one and the same thing. For, say they, "the spiritual part of these names are of the essence of the Spheres" (quoted in Franck, *La Kabbale*, p. 79).

Bousset (page 344) points out the various usages of the Divine name in Apocalyptic Literature, especially in the Books of Enoch. But his contention that it is throughout "eine selbständige Wesenheit" is hardly borne out by the examples he gives. The Divine name is the object of man's praise, man's love. Man's prayers are directed to it. Men find their support in it; the name is mighty, through it is Israel saved. Bousset quotes all the passages containing these ideas. They certainly contain a strong mystical flavour, but only in very few instances can they be rightly said to approach personification. They remind one more of the abundant references to the "name" in the Jewish Prayer Book, which are no more than a reflection of the utter and unspeakable holiness which in many O.T. passages is said to encompass the Divine name. (Cp. Eccle. xvii. 10, xlvi. 10; Tobit iii. 11, viii. 5, xi. 14, xiii. 18, xiv. 9; Psalms of Sol. viii. 26; 4 Es. iv. 25, x. 22, etc.—all quoted by Bousset.)

head and arm of an Israelite are Tephillin on the head and arm of God.⁽⁸⁾

I now add a few aphorisms which express the preceding ideas of God-in-Israel, in terse epigrammatic language :—

“ He who helps Israel, helps God ” (Mechilta on בְּשָׁלֹחַ, edit. Friedmann, p. 39).

“ He who opposes Israel, opposes God ” (*ibid.*).

“ He who blesses Israel, blesses God ” (Tanhuma on יְהוָה).

“ He who hates Israel, hates God ” (Sifri on בְּחִילָתָךְ).

“ He who stands before a saintly man acts as though he stands before God ” (Yalkut on 1 Kings xvii.).⁽⁹⁾

“ He who boxes the ears of an Israelite does the same to God ” (Yalkut on Proverbs xx. from T. B. Sanhedrin 58b).

“ When Israel do what is right, God is strengthened ; when wrong, then God is weakened (Lamentations Rabba i. 33). ” Right-doing adds strength to the Divine element which is in Israel. Wrong-doing diminishes it.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

(1) לְמַעֲנָכֶם שְׁלֵמִי בְּכָלָה, the word שְׁלֵמִי to read שְׁלֵמָה.

(2) זָבַח הַ “ אֲלֵי ” אֵת שְׁבָטָךְ : it is not said זָבַח הַ “ אֲלֵי ” אֵת שְׁבָטָךְ (Kal), “ and He shall return,” i.e. God will return with erstwhile captive Israel when the latter goes into the greater freedom of the Future.

(3) An instance of Rabbinic inconsistency is shown by a passage in the Introduction to Lamentations Rabba xxix., where it is said as follows : “ Before Israel were redeemed from Egypt they dwelt by themselves, and the Shechinah dwelt by itself. When they were redeemed, Shechinah and Israel became one harmony, i.e. blended into one (וְאַתָּה וְאַתָּה). But when Israel went into captivity the Shechinah again separated from them.” This surely contradicts the statement that the Shechinah was always with the Israelites in all their experiences.

(4) Sifri on בְּשָׁלֹחַ has exactly the same wording as the Mechilta. In the Sifri on יְהוָה the phrase נָמָס פָּס is omitted. It is also to be found in

Song of Songs Rabba ii., and in Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah iv. Hal. c. Also in Yalkut on תְּלִילָה and on בָּבָרֶךְ. In Exodus Rabba xxiii. 5 quite other Biblical verses are brought into play. It is noteworthy, that in the Liturgy, the passage recited on Tabernacles festival, בְּחַנּוּתְּךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּלֹא יָמָר, is permeated from beginning to end with these ideas of God's Immanence in Israel.

(5) Expressed, as we have seen above, by the phrase "one harmony."

(6) This is given in the Yalkut on Ezekiel xxxvi. 20, יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶשֶׁךְ בָּבָרֶךְ. The word יְהֹוָה referring to Israel is in the singular, hence it is taken by the Rabbins to refer to God. God, while Israel was in exile, went round to the houses of the nations, etc. A similar idea of God's interest in Israel in the sight of the nations occurs in Tanhuma on בְּשָׂרֶב on the verse, "And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud" (Exodus xiii. 21). "Is it not written, 'Do I not fill the heavens and the earth ?' Again, 'The whole earth is full of His glory.' How then can Scripture say that God walked before them ? It is in order to make the nations know the love which God bears to Israel in order that the nations may treat them with honour."

(7) The Yalkut on Song of Songs (verse, "My beloved went down into His garden," vi. 2) has the following curious passage : "'My beloved went down into His garden.' This means that God goes down into His World. 'To the beds of spices.' This refers to Israel. 'To feed in the gardens.' This alludes to the nations of the world. 'To gather lilies.' These are the saints. God withdraws the saints from among the nations. It may be likened unto an earthly monarch who had a son whom he loved above all others. To show his love for him, he planted him a beautiful orchard. So long as the lad's conduct was pleasing, the king wandered throughout the world in order to find the most precious trees for the orchard. But when the lad offended, then the trees were cut away. God does the same for Israel. As long as Israel does His will, God travels far and wide amongst the nations, and wherever He alights upon a saintly man amongst them, He brings him forthwith into Israel's fold. But when Israel revolts, then He removes the good man from their midst." (See for same, Jerus. Talmud Berachoth in וְכָל־בְּנֵי־עֲמָדָה)

(8) In his *Studies in Judaism*, Shechter has an essay on "The Child in Jewish Literature," in which he alludes to a passage in the Midrash where God is represented as giving instruction daily to a number of prematurely deceased children. This belongs to the same order of Rabbinical teachings as the above. So deeply ingrained is the Divine in Israel, that the sacred duties of the Israelite are also the sacred duties of God.

(9) Derived from the exclamation of Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 1), "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand." The Midrash, basing itself no doubt upon the fact that Elijah had hitherto not imparted any Divine message whatsoever, asks, "Did then Elijah stand before God ?" And the answer given is as follows : "In standing before Ahijah the Shilonite he acted as though he stood before the Shechinah." Serving a saint is equivalent to serving the Shechinah.

CHAPTER X

(E) THE SHECHINAH AND SIN

IT is obvious to the most superficial thinker, that it is far easier to account for sin on the dualistic conception of the relation of God to the world which emphasises the Divine Transcendence, than on the view which insists upon the Immanence. An offence against a God who sits aloof from the world, is a phenomenon which needs no explanation. But if God and His holiness are in the world, and resident in the very heart of things and of man, then all kinds of problems arise and press for solution. If God dwells with and in man, then is not man's sin also God's sin? Or again, "Why does not the indwelling God who is all-powerful prevent the sin?" Or again, "How can man's sin be displeasing to God, seeing that the sin is committed in His sight and with His present and previous knowledge?" Modern theology has its answers to these problems and several kindred ones. It must here be inquired, how the Rabbinic theologians regarded these difficulties, and what attempts they made to reconcile the reality of sin with their doctrines about the Shechinah as the immanent God of the world, of Israel, of Palestine, and of man in general.

(1) There are passages showing how antithetical are Sin and Shechinah. Sin ousts the Shechinah from its place. The modern view of Immanence takes up a similar position. God is in man and eternally prompts

and empowers him to do right. But when he does wrong, man is simply ousting God from within him. He is choking his godly and Godward impulses. The most striking passage in this connexion is Song of Songs Rabba vi. : “The original abode of the Shechinah was among the *חַחְתּוֹנִים*, i.e. among men. When Adam sinned it ascended away to the first heaven. With Cain’s sin it ascended to the second. With Enoch to the third. With the generation of the Flood to the fourth. With the generation of the Tower of Babel to the fifth. With the Sodomites to the sixth. With the sin of the Egyptians in the days of Abraham, it ascended to the seventh. Corresponding to these, there arose seven righteous men who brought the Shechinah down, back again to earth. These were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Kehath, Amram, and Moses. R. Isaac said that this is the interpretation of the verse (Psalm xxxvii. 29), ‘The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever.’ What do the wicked do ? They live suspended in the air, because they have not caused the Shechinah to dwell in the earth. But the righteous shall dwell for ever on the earth, because they have made the Shechinah abide therein for ever.” A slightly altered version is given in Numbers Rabba xii. 6 as well as in Tanhuma on פָּקוּדִי, where, according to Rabba, the Shechinah only came down to earth for the first time at the erection of the Tabernacle. According to R. Simeon bar Judah, the Shechinah came down to earth at the time of creation, went away as soon as Adam sinned, and returned with the erection of the Tabernacle.⁽¹⁾ and ⁽²⁾

It is this sense of conflict between Deity and sin that is expressed in such maxims as “He who sins in secret presses against the feet of the Shechinah” (T. B. Kiddushin 31a), there being no room in the universe for both God and sinner. “A man may not walk even four

cubits with a proud mien, because the whole earth is full of God's glory" (*ibid.*). Pride was always looked upon by the Rabbins as the most heinous and unpardonable of sins, equivalent to the sin of idolatry.⁽³⁾ "God never unites His name with evil in the way that He unites it with good" (Yalkut Ezekiel viii.). Another and fuller version of the latter is given in Yalkut 2 Kings vi. "The name of God is never mentioned in connexion with evil, only with good." This is proved by a quotation from Genesis i. 5, "And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night" (in the Hebrew the word for God precedes the word for light, but is omitted before the word for darkness, the verb only being used). And by another quotation from Genesis i. 28, "And God blessed them," whereas when He punished our first parents Scripture says (iii. 16) and "unto the woman He said, etc." (iii. 17); "And unto Adam He said, etc." the name of God being omitted at the mention of evil. These theories are based by the Midrash on the interpretation of Psalm v. 4, "Evil shall not dwell with Thee," *i.e.* says R. Johanan: "Thou dost not drag after evil, neither does evil drag after thee, and it does not abide with thee."⁽⁴⁾ The root of יגַע is taken to be גַע which = "to drag after," although from the last three words of the sentence לא נאכלך ואמנה דרא it is clear that the correct root רגַע is also admitted. The Rabbins were so fond of playing with words, that it is not always easy to decide, whether their interpretations based upon these plays are to be taken as maxims with a serious ethical purpose, or as mere exhibitions of skill in the use of words.⁽⁵⁾

Another aspect of the conflict between Shechinah and sin is afforded by an interesting remark in the Pesikta Rabbati, edit. Friedmann, p. 21 (reproduced in Numbers Rabba xii. 3 and in Midrash Tillim xci.), "Until

the Tabernacle was erected the evil spirits (^{רִוחַם}) held sway in the universe. But with the erection of the Tabernacle the Shechinah came in to earth, and then the evil spirits were dislodged and exterminated.”⁽⁶⁾

There is another department of this important subject, which at first sight appears to be the diametrical opposite of the first. Instances have been quoted to show the antithesis between Shechinah and sin, how the Rabbins endeavoured to clear the Deity of all possible contact with evil, God and sin being in their opinion mutually exclusive ideas.⁽⁷⁾ It is now desirable to quote equally emphatic allusions to the Shechinah countenancing sin and dwelling in contact with it. This apparent contradiction is accounted for as follows : An examination of all the passages bearing on the subject, shows that wherever Shechinah and sin are antithetical, the reference is either to the sin of an individual or of a section of Israelites, whereas in all those passages where Shechinah and sin are in consonance, the allusion is to the sin or evil of the collective body of Israelites. The underlying idea is only another form of the emphatic assertion so constantly repeated throughout the pages of Rabbinic literature, of the Immanence of God in Israel. God dwells in Israel at all costs. Whether Israel be in good or evil repute, God is there. To ask the question how the Rabbins could harmonise their doctrines of God’s aloofness from evil, with their doctrine of God’s Immanence in Israel in spite of Israel’s wickedness, is to go beyond the scope of Rabbinic logic.* Consistency was not a marked feature of the latter.

* This is not to discredit Rabbinism in any sense. On p. 304 of Sanday and Headlam’s Commentary on Romans (*International Critical Commentary*) the authors, after speaking of the ways in which St. Paul uses words in a sense opposed to the original context, remark : “Where does the superiority of the New Testament writers lie ? In their correct interpretation of the spirit of the Old Testament. As expounders of religion they belong to the whole world ; as logicians they belong to the first century.”

The Talmud is not a symmetric picture. It presents not a doctrine, but a congeries of doctrines often at variance with one another. The interest is centrifugal rather than centripetal. It shows how many differing themes may be elaborated out of one central subject. It makes no attempt to wind these differing themes round a common thread. Bearing this in mind, it need occasion no surprise if it is possible to quote numerous allusions to the idea of the Deity dwelling with Israel in spite of Israel's impurity and sin.

One of the clearest statements on this head is based on Leviticus xvi. 16, "And so shall he do for the Tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness." The Tabernacle (*בְּנֵזֶב*) = the Shechinah.⁽⁸⁾

"The Shechinah dwells with Israel even though they be impure" (Yalkut on Ezekiel xxxvi. and frequently). The Rabbins made much of the phrase in Ezekiel xxxvi. 17, כִּי־רוֹמָאַת דְּנַדָּה ; it is not the same as כִּי־רוֹמָאַת מִתְ ; a "Kohen" may keep company with the former but must have no contact with the latter; Israel being likened by the prophet to the former and not to the latter, may therefore always hope to be in the company of God. A kindred idea is to be found in Exodus Rabba xv. 5, where God is said to have revealed Himself "in a place of idolatry, filth, and uncleanness in order to redeem Israel."⁽⁹⁾ These ideas are an expansion of the oft-recurring Biblical references to the sonship of Israel. The Sifri on a passage in Deuteronomy (xxxii. 5) says, "Although they [i.e. Israel] are full of blemishes, yet they are called sons."⁽¹⁰⁾ The Yalkut on Lamentations iii. 3 compares this sonship to the case of an earthly monarch who yearns and frets for his son's company, no matter what the latter's failings and offences may be.

Other aspects of treatment are the following :

Yalkut on Esther vi., "Does God sleep? No. But when Israel sleeps He feigns sleep, but when they do His will, then the Guardian of Israel neither slumbereth nor sleepeth." The idea of the Deity sleeping while Israel is sinning is a pretty specimen of Midrashic poetry. Tanhuma on בָּהַר פְּרִזְבֵּן "four faces," inside the Temple. The Shechinah departs from the sinful scene in the deepest disgust. But it departs, only to come back again through the repentance of the Israelites. The great Rabbinic antidote to sin is repentance. God is with Israel in his sin, only because He has implanted within him this virtue of repentance. Repentance is almost a synonym for Shechinah. It is a Divine indwelling.⁽¹¹⁾ It is that alone which makes sin bearable, forgivable.*

* It is of great interest to note how much closer is this old-world Rabbinic view of sin to the modern scientific-theological view than to the orthodox traditional view of Christianity. This is exemplified in a work recently published (Clarke and Co., 1909) by W. E. Orchard, D.D., entitled *Modern Theories of Sin*. The author, after dwelling on the inadequacy of the Church doctrines of grace, justification, atonement, etc., to explain the forgiveness of sin from the standpoint of history and personal experience, establishes the following data: (1) "The pain that man feels for his sin is the awakening to the long-suffering of God who . . . has drawn near to us, etc." Did not the Rabbis poetically foreshadow this idea by their dictum about God being asleep while Israel is in sin? Is not this merely another way of describing His long-suffering with sin? (2) "There could be no knowledge of our sin and no penitence for it unless God had forgiven us sufficiently to dwell with us" (pp. 144, 145). An exact echo of a host of Rabbinic statements on Repentance. There is no notion here of an angry God, whose wrath with the world could only be appeased, by the voluntary self-sacrifice of some divine individual who took upon himself the whole guilt of mankind, in order to clear them of their age-long guilt before God. The psychology of the religious consciousness does not tally with this teaching. It tallies, however, with the Rabbinic view which represents God as a father who is steeped in love for his wayward offspring, and stretches out his hand the whole day long, to receive the erring one again in his forgiving embrace; and the erring one returns to the father. Why not? Is not the seed of filial love implanted even in the worst specimen of a child! God has implanted this seed—Repentance—in the heart of the Israelite. This, and this alone, is the latter's assurance that God is nigh unto him, that His attitude toward him is gracious and not angry, that He takes pity on him, and condescends in a nearness of fellowship to dwell again with him. Hence forgiveness of God and repentance by man are obverse sides of the same shield. The innate ability to produce the latter, is the signal that the former has been achieved. There could be no penitence for sin, unless God had first vouchsafed His forgiveness. Conversely, forgiveness of sin could have no meaning for us, were it not for the fact of that Divine indwelling which expresses itself in repentance.

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

(1) There is another view in a long passage in *Aboth De R. Nathan* xxxiv.

(2) R. Isaac's idea of the wicked as suspended in the air seems to be a fanciful way of stating the truth that the bad man's existence is a blank. The Shechinah fills all space, heaven as well as earth. The godless man must therefore exist in some region which is neither heaven nor earth. This, in R. Isaac's naive conception, is the air.

(3) The Baraita quoted in T. B. Berachoth 27b gives instances of offences committed by a disciple against his master, which cause the Shechinah to go away from Israel.

(4) Tanhuma on *y'm*. The same antithesis between Deity and sin is expressed in the remark, "Only angels of peace can stand before God. Angels of anger are far from Him who is slow to anger." In T. B. Sabbath 56a in connexion with the remark, viz. "All who say David sinned (in connexion with Bathsheba) are wrong," the question is asked, "Would the Shechinah be with him while sin was in his hand?"

(5) The truth of this, is seen in these very Midrashic passages about the name of God never being intermingled with the mention of evil. The Rabbins are candid enough to upset their own very theories! In the very heat of their endeavour to prove how the name of God is never associated with evil, they adduce instances to show the contrary (e.g. Daniel ix. 14, "Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us"). It shows that their deductions are often verbal rather than real!

(6) This belongs to the department of Jewish angelology and demonology, a vast province of old Rabbinic thought, but lacking systematisation. An excellent summary is afforded by the articles of Ludwig Blau and Kauffmann Kohler, in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. i.

(7) Another instance of this is the query in Sifri on *מִלְעָנִים*, and frequently, "Can God have any haters?"

(8) I have already dwelt on the connexion between Shechinah and *רַבָּא*, and their relations to the New Testament usage of *σκηνή*.

(9) A kindred idea is that of Exodus Rabba xxiv. 3 on the verse "And Moses caused Israel to journey from the Red Sea, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur" (Exod. xv. 22). It remarks, "Although Israel is in sin, God leads them like a shepherd his flock."

(10) This passage is *וְאֵת כָּל־בָּנֶיךָ נָזֵב*, an extremely difficult verse to translate. According to the Sifri quoted above, it should be rendered thus: "When corruption is theirs (*וְאֵת* *נָזֵב*), the blemish (*i.e.* sin) is not in His sons," *i.e.* however sinful Israel shows himself, he does not forfeit his sonship to God.

(11) This view of Repentance, as showing the Divine possibilities latent in man, seems to me to underlie the batch of statements in Sifri on *מִלְעָנִים* which speak of *בְּרִית וְרִיבָּה* and *בְּרִית וְרִיבָּה*, "before and after the Divine decree." For instance, it is asked how can a statement like "O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come" (Psalm lv. 2), be

made to tally with a statement like "Thou hast covered Thyself with a cloud that prayer should not pass through" (Lam. of Jeremiah iii. 44)? Or how can an exhortation like "Seek ye the Lord while He may be found" (Isaiah lv. 6), be reconciled with "As I live, saith the Lord God, I will not be inquired of by you" (Ezekiel xx. 3)? Or a verse like "For I have no pleasure in the death of Him that dieth" (Ezekiel xviii. 32), with the statement "Because the Lord was pleased to slay them" (1 Sam. ii. 25)? And the answer given is that God's leniency is available only "before the Divine decree," i.e. before the irrevocable sentence has gone forth; after this, i.e. "after the Divine decree," man can only expect a stern retribution. The underlying assumption right through this teaching is the everlasting possibility of man's anticipating the Divine decree. God waits for him. The "after the Divine decree" rarely or never comes! It is an indefinitely postponed point of time. Man has it in him to make amends, and the door is always open, never closed. Repentance is the Divine principle in man, the Shechinah or Divine indwelling in man asserting itself. In his *Mystical Element of Religion* (vol. ii. p. 68), Baron Von Hügel quotes Romans vi. 12-14, vii. 22, 23, viii. 4-13, to show how Paul's view of the Spirit as the counter-working force within man, striving for complete domination over the lusts of the flesh, stands in marked superiority over the Jewish O.T. view, where the contrast is mainly between "the visible and transitory," i.e. between the greatness of the eternal God and the weakness and fallibility of man. This may be so, but it only goes to prove the considerable advance in theological thought made by the doctors of the post-Biblical Babylonian and Palestinian academies. For the golden hallmark of their teaching is just this, that the Spirit in man is stronger than the anti-spirit lust; the whole Rabbinic doctrine of the efficacy of Repentance presupposes this. Von Hügel points out how the synoptists in utterances like "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak," and "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," do not rise above the inferior level of the O.T. view. In the variegated mass of doctrine about sin, which one finds in Talmud and Midrash, one does occasionally come across an opinion which tends to look at sin from a similarly apologetic standpoint, sin as the inevitable result of folly, and so forth, and therefore excusable. But the main trend of Rabbinic opinion brooks no such dallying with sin. The Divine in man pleads for the upright life; conversion to it is easy. God fore-ordained it. If man refuses to listen to the higher call his refusal is sin, and no plea of weakness or such like, can palliate or deny it.

CHAPTER XI

(F) THE SHECHINAH AND THE TORAH

THE Torah and sin are the two opposite poles of conduct. When spoken of in antithesis to Torah, sin generally goes by the name of "the evil impulse." This evil impulse is the inveterate enemy of the Torah, prepared at any moment to fight it to the death. But the Torah must be the ultimate victor. "Just as water wears away stone, so the Torah will wear away the evil impulse" (T. B. Sukkah 52b). "Just as iron can be made into all sorts of vessels if cast into the fire, so one can make the evil impulse useful by words of the Torah; it is learned from Proverbs xxv. 21 that if thine enemy be hungry (*i.e.* when the evil impulse prompts thee) give him bread to eat (*i.e.* bread of the Torah; Pesikta De R. Kahana, edit. Buber 80b)." "If this base fellow (*i.e.* the evil impulse) attack thee, drag him to the 'Beth Hamidrash' [where he will meet his match in the Torah]" (Sukkah 52b).* If the Torah wields so mighty, so invincible a power over evil, it follows that its conscientious student, or practical observer, will be a man of the highest and godliest impulses. The Shechinah will be in him and with him. His triumph over sin will in the last resort be the Shechinah's

* "There shall no strange god be in thee" (Psalm lxxxi. 9). On which the sages remark, "What is the strange god that is in the body of man? It is the evil impulse" (T. B. Sabbath 105b). This is a peculiar instance of personification, or rather, deification.

triumph over sin. It is in this sense that the Rabbins often speak. There is a passage in Yalkut Lamentations iii. which says that the "Talmid Ḥacham" who sits in private and studies Torah, has God actually sitting with him and joining in his meditations. Similarly, Yalkut on Song of Songs i., in commenting on the verse i. 2, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth," declares that "when two colleagues sit and study the Halacha together, it is as if they kiss God."⁽¹⁾ The passage in T. B. Berachoth 6a (repeated in Yalkut on Psalm lxxxii.) about the Shechinah abiding in the midst of two or even one when studying the Torah is very familiar.⁽²⁾ Yalkut on Psalm lxviii. instances the fact, that when five elders proceed to intercalate the year, God places His Shechinah among them, so that they may get enlightenment in the Halacha, and not err. It is probably on this basis that the Rabbins founded their ideas so often expressed about God introducing new Halachas daily in His Celestial Beth Din (see Genesis Rabba xlix. 2, Yalkut on Job xxxvii.), or about God's holding the Torah in His right hand (Deuteronomy Rabba iv. 4), or of the taking counsel with the Torah before creating the world (Tanhuma on Genesis i. 1), or the extraordinary statement in Tanhuma on נזירים about the Torah being extant on the arm of God before the creation of the universe. An even more curious passage is that of the Yalkut on 2 Samuel xx. (from the Tanna Debe Elijah): "If a man possesses good morals and a knowledge of Hebrew reading (מקרא) only, then there is given him one angel solely to guard him, as Scripture says, 'Behold I send an angel before thee.' If one has studied the Torah, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, then two angels are vouchsafed unto him, as Scripture says, 'For He shall give His angels

charge over thee, to guard thee in all thy ways.' But if one has studied the Torah, Prophets, Hagiographa, the Mishna, Midrash, Halacha and Haggada, then God Himself has charge over him." The Midrash enforces these statements by a parable, the point of which is to show the ever-present Divine protection which hedges round the good man. It is important to note the idea of the angels as being, so to speak, an inferior degree of Divine Immanence in the world and man. The man of secondary merits receives the angel. The first-class saint or student of the Torah has the privilege of the highest of all forms of guardianship, that of the Shechinah.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

(1) Cp. T. B. Berachoth 64a, "He that partakes of a meal at which a 'Talmid Ḥaham' is seated, acts as though he partook of the Shechinah."

(2) It is interesting to note the strong personification of Shechinah in this passage in T. B. Berachoth 6a. The question is there raised, "If it be true that the Shechinah abides in the company of three who study Torah, what necessity is there to point out that it abides also in the company of ten who study Torah? Surely the latter can be taken for granted? And the answer is, "When ten study Torah, the Shechinah takes its seat by their side as soon as they enter the study-house, even before they actually seat themselves down. But in the case of three, the Shechinah is not with them until they have thoroughly seated and arranged themselves for study."

CHAPTER XII

(G) THE SHECHINAH AND THE WORD

IN the course of an examination of Rabbinic passages bearing on Shechinah, one alights upon many an allusion to the "Word" (in Hebrew "Dibbur" or "Ma'amar"), and it soon becomes noticeable that there is a kinship between the two. The personification is equally strong in both. The "Word" at once reminds us of the Targumic Memra,⁽¹⁾ which is perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the Targum literature. And one is led on to think in this connexion of the Logos of Philo and the "Word" of St. John's Gospel. But close study very soon dispels the idea that the latter two terms are identical with Memra or Shechinah or Dibbur. Philo's Logos differs in at least three important respects from the Rabbinic conceptions. These are (1) that it is a piece of metaphysics, a philosophical term quite foreign to Rabbinic methods of interpretation. (2) That it is impersonal, whereas the Rabbinic terms stand for a Personal God, a father into whose ears man can pour the tale of his troubles, and receive a comforting reply. (3) The Logos is often the intermediary between man and God, the "paraclete" of humanity, whereas the Rabbins repudiated in the strongest possible language, any intervening personality between man and his Maker.*

* As Bousset says (page 346): "Der Logos Philos hat mit der oben erwähnten rabbinischen Spekulation wenig gemein." Volz (*Der Geist Gottes*,

The most frequent usage of the “Word” is in connexion with cosmology. The foundation to work upon is the Psalmist’s expression, “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made” (xxxiii. 6). Genesis Rabba xii. 2 says, “Not by labour and not by toil did God create His world, but by the word.” *Ibid.* xvii. 1 has the familiar saying about the world having been created by ten Words (*בשורה מאמרות*).⁽²⁾ The Word here is an aspect of God’s creative energy.⁽³⁾ But it need not of necessity point to any immanent Divine activity in the world. As it stands in the passage just quoted, it might with equal justice be interpreted in a transcendent sense. The world was created by the Word, after which it retired absolutely from the scene. But there is an important passage in the Sifri on *ברכה* (quoted also in Song of Songs Rabba i. 3), in which the “Word” is strongly personified, and is merely another aspect of the Rabbinic teaching about Divine Immanence in Israel, of which I have spoken in connexion with Shechinah. “The Word emerged from the right hand of God and went to the left of Israel; thence returning, it surrounded the camp of Israel, which was eighteen miles by eighteen miles; thence returning it went round from the right of Israel to the left of God, who received it on His right, and afterwards engraved it on the tablet; and its voice resounded from one end of the world to another, fulfilling the statement of Scripture, ‘The voice of the Lord divideth the flame of fire’ (Psalm xxix. 7).” Rabbi Moses Alshech⁽⁴⁾

Tübingen, 1910) says: “Mag Philo diesen seinen Zentralbegriff vom Stoizismus oder von der ägyptischen Speculation oder von beiden übernommen haben, jedenfalls zeigt das Verhältniss von Logos und göttlichen Pneuma in Philo, dass der alexandrinische Denker sich mehr mit der griechisch-ägyptischen als mit der ATlich-jüdischen Begriffswelt berührte.” There are, however, as we have seen, a few allusions to the *מִמְרָאָה* as well as to angels in Talmudic literature which run very near to the paraclete idea of Philo, similarly in the case of Memra, particularly in the Jerusalem Targum.

in his commentary on the Song of Songs, as well as in the commentary on the Midrash Rabba יפה קול נ' , takes the passage in a strictly spiritual sense as showing the triumph of the Divine in man over the unworthy side of his nature, the promptings of his evil impulse. Another passage in Song of Songs Rabba vi. 3 represents the "Word" as interceding before God on behalf of the Israelites, who were frightened to death when they heard the first syllables of the Ten Commandments on Sinai. The commentator before mentioned, here explains the "Word" as being identical with an angel, on the basis of the remark in T. B. Haggigah 14a, "from every word which comes out of the mouth of the Almighty there is created an angel."⁽⁵⁾

Deuteronomy Rabba ix. 9 relates a conversation between Moses, shortly before his death, and Joshua, in which the former asks the latter, "What did the Word say unto thee?" Joshua replies, "At the moment when the Word revealed itself unto thee, didst thou know what it said unto thee?" Here "Word" seems the exact equivalent of Divine inspiration.⁽⁶⁾

Sifri on בְּהַלְלוֹת, commenting on the passage (Numbers xii. 8) on the words וּמְרָאָה לֹא בְּחִזְוּת, says that the allusion is to מְרָאָה דָבָר, "The sight of the Word." The Word was a physical reality to Moses in his inspired moments.

That the Rabbins conceived the "Word" as closely akin to the Shechinah ideas, is seen from a passage to be found in Mechilta,⁽⁷⁾ p. 1, edit. Friedmann (quoted also in brief in Yalkut Ezekiel i. and in Tanhuma בָא), where it is pointed out, how the Shechinah, by successive stages, became narrowed down from being the possession of all lands, to being the possession of the Temple at Jerusalem only. And it is noticeable how Shechinah and "Dibbur" are indiscriminately used in the course of the discussion.⁽⁸⁾ Like the Shechinah the "Dibbur"

only exists in place of purity.* They are both similarly and equally antithetical to sin.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

(1) "Memra" is confined to the Targumim. It never occurs in the Talmud or Midrashim. "Dibbur" and "Ma'amar" are used interchangeably in the Midrash, although the latter is more frequently employed where cosmology is spoken of. The word "Shechinah" occurs, of course, frequently in the Targum (and often like Memra, with the sole purpose of avoiding any semblance of anthropomorphism), but it has nothing like the frequency of Memra. Wherever the Memra is not introduced for the sole purpose of avoiding anthropomorphism, it is to express the manifestation of the Divine power or Divine Wisdom in the universe and in man. In these respects its meaning and force are largely paralleled by those of Shechinah.

(2) See T. B. Megillah 21b; Aboth v. 1.

(3) In Deuteronomy Rabba v. 13 there is a curious play upon words in the case of וְדָבָר = Word, and וְמֵתָה = Pestilence. God says that just as He brought the world into life by the word, so He can remove it from life by the pestilence.

(4) Moses Alshech was Rabbi in Safed in the second half of the sixteenth century. He was a disciple of Joseph Karo. He wrote homiletical commentaries on the Bible, and was widely celebrated as a preacher.

(5) The Yalkut on Song of Songs i says, "One angel goes forth before every 'Dibbur,' and asks every Israelite in turn whether he accepts such and such a particular 'Dibbur' and all that it implies."

(6) This usage of "Dibbur" in the sense of prophetic inspiration is found particularly in the Rabbinic dictum (given in Genesis Rabba lii. 5 and other places), "God reveals Himself to heathen prophets only by a half Dibbur."

(7) See Friedmann's remark on the opening verse of the Mechilta. Instead of וְדָבָר he reads וְמֵתָה, and quotes the authority of the "Kol Bo" for the reading in the Haggada of Passover night וְמֵתָה בַּיּוֹם, in deference to the phrase in Jeremiah v. 13; it is, he says, the equivalent of the Targumic Memra.

(8) But in Friedmann's edition of Mechilta this indiscrimination is corrected. He manages to keep the two expressions distinct from each other. But the similarity in their meanings is quite obvious from the context.

* The Shechinah, as has been mentioned before, also exists, under certain conditions, in places of impurity. I have been unable to discover any passages which say this of the "Dibbur."

CHAPTER XIII

(H) THE MEMRA

SEVERAL phases of Rabbinic teaching about Divine immanence are comprehended in the connotation of the word "Memra." But the usage of this word is confined exclusively to the Targumic literature. The Rabbinic equivalent is "Ma'amar," but it is rarely employed, and even then, its significance is not identical with Memra. The latter seems to be a transliteration of the Syriac ^{مَلَكُمْ} which = "word" in the general sense, without any theological reference whatsoever.⁽¹⁾

The Targumim are a branch of Rabbinic literature ; both Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uziel were pupils of the Talmudic doctors,⁽²⁾ and although there is much difference of opinion among scholars like Graetz, Friedmann, and Bacher as to the exact identity of Onkelos and Jonathan and their relations to the works which bear their names, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Targumim are a product of the activity of the Palestinian academies. The frequent deviations from the literalness of the Scriptural text, and the abundance of purely Midrashic methods of interpretation, prove this.⁽³⁾

The Targumic usage of the Memra,⁽⁴⁾ although it has resemblances to the Rabbinic connotation of Shechinah, nevertheless constitutes a new departure. It enters into the relations between the human and the Divine,

between God, man and the world, to an even greater extent than the Shechinah. The view commonly taken that the Memra is an expedient for avoiding the ascription of anthropomorphism to the Deity, is only half the truth.⁽⁵⁾ As a matter of fact, the Targum is guilty of many anthropomorphisms. This has been shown by (among others) M. Ginsburger in an essay in the *Zeit. f. prot. Theologie*, 1891, entitled “*Die Anthropomorphismen in den Targumim.*” He lays down the following rule, which is a very valuable guide to the study of the Memra : “ Whenever a relation is predicated of God, through which His spiritual presence an earthly being must be assumed, the paraphrase with Memra is employed.” Ginsburger rightly argues that the Memra is no mere term of convenience, no mere mechanical artifice thrown in at random, for no more than the outward purpose of stripping the Deity of corporeality. It has a deep and real theological import. Some such view as this was also held by Nahmanides. His ideas on the point are of great interest, and are given in a passage of his *Commentary on the Bible* (Genesis xlvi. 4), where he subjects the rationalistic tendencies of Maimonides to very strong criticism. Nahmanides argues, that if the sole object of the Targumic authors in their usages of the terms Memra, Shechinah, Yekarah, etc., were the avoidance of anthropomorphism, why do we find such literal renderings as “*וְאָמַרְתִּי*,” “and God called,” or “and God spake,” “*וְהָלֹךְ*?”⁽⁶⁾ Surely to attribute speech to God is to regard Him in the guise of a man?^{(7)*} Nahmanides quotes further instances. In Exodus xiv. 31 Onkelos renders the verse as : “*וְיָצָא אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם*” “And Israel saw the might of the great hand.” If this is not anthropomorphic, what is ? Again, Exodus xxxi. 18

* It should here be said, as Mr. Israel Abrahams has pointed out to me, that Maimonides was of opinion that our current Targum texts do not always contain the original readings. His opinion is substantiated by many modern scholars.

is literally translated as “with the finger of God”⁽⁸⁾; similarly Deut. iv. 34, “with a strong hand and an out-stretched arm,” is literally rendered. And in Deut. xi. 12 Onkelos has no hesitation in speaking of the “eyes” of God as being constantly upon the land “from the beginning of the year even to the end of the year.” On the other hand, argues Nahmanides, there are many instances where the Targum inserts the word Memra (or Shechinah), even when there is no danger of anthropomorphism.⁽⁹⁾ In Exodus xvi. 8, “Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord”; here the murmurings are made to be “against the Memra of the Lord,” although there is no necessity for the addition. To murmur against God, does not imply corporeality on His part. Similarly in Genesis ix. 16, 17, Exodus xxxi. 17, the rainbow and the Sabbath respectively are a sign between man and the Memra; and in Genesis xxxi. 49, 50, where “Mitspah” and “the heap” are the witness between Jacob and Laban on the one hand, and the Memra on the other. From these and other examples, Nahmanides rightly draws the two following conclusions: (a) that there is no systematic avoidance of anthropomorphism in the Targum literature; (b) that the Memra has a deep theological or mystical significance. It is noteworthy that he does not particularise this significance. He says simply, “their secret is known to students.”⁽¹⁰⁾ But a knowledge of Nahmanides’ general theological system leaves no room to doubt, that he was here alluding to what is the key-stone of his teaching, viz. the Immanence of God. God’s presence in the world was a reality to Nahmanides; and his constantly reiterated views on such things as creation, miracles, the soul, the Torah, etc., all hinge upon his unyielding belief in the closest contact between the Deity and the World.⁽¹¹⁾

Nahmanides has struck the right note. An examination of nearly all the passages in the *Targumim* where the word is used, leads to the conclusion that the Memra has mystical bearings ; it connotes relationships between the Deity and the world which are part and parcel of Rabbinic thought on these matters.⁽¹²⁾

The Memra is the development of the Psalmist's simple but great utterance, "For He spake, and it was ; He commanded, and it stood fast" (*Psalm xxxiii. 9*). It is the expounding of the "Word" from the Jewish point of view. All things exist by virtue of the word (*i.e.* Memra) of God. It permeates everything, brings everything into the realm of being, conditions everything. It is the immanent manifestation of God in the world of matter and spirit. Divine wisdom, Divine power, Divine love, Divine justice, all these do not abide in the highest heavens, isolated, unapproachable, unknowable. They are imbedded in the scheme of things that we can see and feel and touch and know. They are a part of the constitution of man and the world. Man and the world are a fragment of them. The Memra comprises and expresses these teachings.

The various significations of the Memra may be classified as follows :—

(A) THE MEMRA AS DIVINE WISDOM, POWER, AND LOVE

The immanent God of Judaism is, as was said at the beginning of this book, the all-pervading divine personality who is a mixture of wisdom, power, and love. To these must be added a fourth, viz. justice ; but this must be dealt with separately. The oft-repeated Biblical and Rabbinical portraiture of God as a father, with the father's compassion for the children, is unintelligible without this assumption.

I. *Genesis*.—In iii. 8, “And they heard the voice of the Memra walking in the garden.” It is interesting to note that Nahmanides says that the words allude to “the manifestation of the Shechinah in that place,” a significant identification of Memra and Shechinah.⁽¹³⁾

In vii. 16 the Jerusalem Targum has, “And the Memra closed the door of the ark in his [Noah’s] face.”

In xv. 1, “Fear not, Abram, my Memra shall be strong unto thee.”

Idem verse 6, “And Abram believed in the Memra of God.”⁽¹⁴⁾

In xxviii. 20, 21, “If the Memra shall be my help.” “And the Memra of God shall be unto me for a God.” Nahmanides remarks on the latter verse, “There is a secret in this context.” By this he means that it possesses a mystical connotation.

In xxxv. 3, “And I will make there an altar to the God who answered me in the day of my trouble and whose Memra was my support on the way that I went.”

II. *Exodus*.—In iii. 12, “And he said, Verily my Memra shall be thy support” (same in Pseudo-Jonathan).

In iv. 12, “And now, go, and my Memra shall be with thy mouth” (Pseudo-Jonathan has, “And I, with my Memra, shall be with the speech of thy mouth”). Similarly in iv. 15.

In xii. 29, “And it came to pass in the middle of the night that the Memra of God smote all the first-born, etc.” So in Pseudo-Jonathan, but not found in ordinary edition of Onkelos.

In xiv. 31, “And the people feared the Lord and they believed in the Memra of the Lord.” So Onkelos. Pseudo-Jonathan has, “And they believed in the name of the Memra of the Lord.” Possibly, there is an allusion here to the Rabbinic belief in the miracle-

performing power of the Divine name (see e.g. T. B. Makkoth 11a).⁽¹⁵⁾ In the Kabbalistic system of cosmology the combinations of Divine names play a large part.⁽¹⁶⁾ In T. B. Yoma 73b, it is stated that when the Urim and Thummim were consulted, the letters of the Divine name were lit up, and brought into such a combination, as to make the answer intelligible. Not only the names of God, but those of the angels as well, constitute a fundamental part of the Jewish mysticism of both Talmud and Kabbalah.⁽¹⁷⁾

In xvi. 8, "Not against us are your murmurings, but against the Memra of God."⁽¹⁸⁾

In xix. 17, "And Moses brought forth the people towards the Memra of God." So Onkelos. It is noteworthy that Pseudo-Jonathan renders "towards the Shechinah of God," thus again showing the close association between the ideas.

In xx. 1 it is noteworthy that both Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan render literally "and God spake." But the Jerus. Targum has "and the Memra spake."

In xxv. 22, "And I shall prepare my Memra for thee there."

In xxxiii. 22, "And I shall protect thee with my Memra until I pass." It is noteworthy that in Pseudo-Jonathan we get the two phrases "Memra" and יְהוָה שְׁכִינָתִי in the same sentence. The latter is the rendering for the Hebrew כָּבוֹד, "my glory," and the former for כַּפֵּר, "my hand." Thus, the Shechinah would seem to be the glory of the Immanent God in the general sense; the Memra would be an aspect or particular expression of this, viz. the protection or providence of the Immanent God.⁽¹⁹⁾

III. *Leviticus*.—In v. 21 Pseudo-Jonathan has, "If a man sin and speak falsehood against the name of the Memra of God." Here there is again the mystical

personification of the Name which we have just alluded to. Onkelos has simply, "before God." In xx. 23, "For all these things have they done, and my Memra has removed them afar." The Memra is the punitive agency, which must be considered later on.

In xxvi. 46, "These are the statutes and the judgments and the laws which the Lord gave between His Memra and the children of Israel."

IV. *Numbers*.—In x. 35, "Reveal Thyself now, O Memra of God, in Thy great anger, and let the enemies of Thy people be scattered" (Pseudo-Jonathan). Onkelos renders exactly as in the Biblical text. The Jerusalem Targum is identical in meaning, though not in phrasing, with Pseudo-Jonathan, but it has the following significant addition, "and cause the glory of Thy Shechinah to rest among them." It is interesting to observe here, how the Shechinah is secondary, and not parallel to, the Memra. The Memra is to shed the Shechinah upon Israel. (A similar instance of the Memra leading the people to glory is Isaiah lxiii. 14, "As a beast goeth along in the plain, thus the Memra of God led them."⁽²⁰⁾ Here Memra is the translation of the Hebrew "Ruah," "spirit.")

In xiv. 9, "And the Memra of God is our help, fear them not."

Ibid. 11, "And how long will they not believe in my Memra?"⁽²¹⁾

In xxiii. 8, "How shall I curse those of the house of Jacob, seeing that the Memra of God has blessed them? How shall I make small those of the house of Israel, seeing that the Memra of God has made them great?"

In xxiii. 21, "The Memra of the Lord their God is their help, and the Shechinah of their king is among them." Here the two terms are used in a parallel sense. (Compare Hosea ix. 10, where the Memra finds Israel

in the wilderness, as a vine planted by a well of water ; also Hosea xi. 4, where the Memra is the good ploughman, who lightens the yoke from the backs of the oxen.)

V. *Deuteronomy*.—In i. 32, “And in this thing ye do not believe in the Memra of the Lord your God” (also i. 30, “The Memra of the Lord your God who walketh before you shall make war for you”). In iv. 33, “Hath any people heard the voice of the Memra of God speaking from the midst of the fire ?” (similar idea in iv. 36). In v. 35, “I was standing between the Memra of God and between you.” In v. 11 (Pseudo-Jonathan), “Oh, my people, sons of Israel, swear not one of you in the name of the Memra of the Lord your God.”

In v. 21 (Pseudo-Jonathan), “And ye said, Verily the Memra of the Lord your God hath shown you the ‘Shechinah’ of His glory, and the greatness of His praise. And the voice of His Memra have we heard from the midst of the fire ; this day have we seen that the Lord speaketh with a man in whom is the Holy Spirit, and he liveth.” It is remarkable that we have here all three phases of Divine Immanence which we are investigating, viz. the Shechinah, Memra, and the Holy Spirit.

In xxxiii. 7 there is a direct invocation to the Memra as follows : “Hear, O Memra of God, the voice of Judah’s prayer, and be a stay and support to him from his enemies” (Jerus. Targum, *ad loc.*).

(B) THE MEMRA AS DIVINE JUSTICE

It is the Memra who is always the subject of swearing or oathtaking. Either the Memra takes the oath, or God swears by His Memra. This is the way in

which Targumic literature describes Divine fidelity to Divine promises whether to reward or punish.

In Genesis vi. 6, “And God turned from His Memra by which He had made man in the land, and He said by His Memra to break their strength according to His will” (Onkelos).⁽²²⁾ Jerusalem Targum has the same, except that it ends up, “and He brought affliction upon them by His Memra.”

In Genesis viii. 21, “And God said by His Memra, I will not again curse the ground for the sake of man, etc.”

In Genesis xx. 3, “And the Memra of God came to Abimelech in a dream of the night.”

In Genesis xxx. 23, xxiv. 3, xxii. 16, we get the Memra as the subject of the oath.

In Exodus xxxii. 13 same as in Genesis.

In Exodus xxxii. 35, “And the Memra of God plagued the people” (Jerusalem Targum). The just retribution which falls upon the heads of the calf-worshippers is effected by the Memra.

In Leviticus xxvi. 30, the Hebrew, “And my soul shall abhor you,” is rendered, “And my Memra shall remove you afar off.” The Memra here is the avenger of the wayward Israelites (cp. Isaiah i. 14; Ezekiel xxiii. 18).

In Numbers xiv. 30 we have again the Memra as the instrument of the Divine oath (cp. Ezekiel xx. 5).

In Deuteronomy ix. 3, “And thou shalt know this day that the Lord thy God passeth before thee ; His Memra is a devouring fire.” So Onkelos renders. Pseudo-Jonathan instead of “He passeth before thee,” has, “The Shechinah of His glory walketh before thee.”⁽²³⁾

I think one can safely make the following deductions from this short exposition of the usage of Memra :

(1) That besides being a mere artifice for avoiding anthropomorphism, the Memra has, to the minds of the Targumic authors, some real theological connotation. (2) That it connotes the manifestation on earth and among men of several aspects of Divine power, goodness, wisdom and justice. The "Word" is a world-permeating force, a reality in the world of matter or mind, the immanent aspect of God holding all things under its omnipresent sway. (3) That it has affinities in meaning to both Shechinah and Holy Spirit, except that these, as can be readily seen from the examples given, are more generally used in the Targumim to denote the Immanent Deity from the standpoint of glory, majesty, etc., whereas the Memra more frequently signifies the immanent creative, controlling, guiding principle rather from the standpoint of force than of love, although, of course, it often appears in the latter senses as well. (4) That it has affinities with the employment of "wisdom" in the Apocryphal literature. Just as the Memra is punitive and will brook neither evil nor evil-doers, so also "Wisdom will not enter into a soul that deviseth evil; nor dwell in a body that is held in pledge by sin" (Wisdom of Solomon i. 4-5), and it brings just retribution on tyrants and oppressors. "Their enemies she drowned, and out of the bottom of the deep she cast them out" (x. 19). Just as the Memra is the great healer and preserver of the saints, so also "Thy word, O Lord, healeth all things" (Wisdom xvi. 12), and "Thy word preserveth them that put their trust in Thee" (xvi. 26). (5) That it is not used as an intermediary between man and God; and this accords with the Rabbinic anxiety to avoid all possible suspicion of teaching the existence of two beings having equal or nearly equal Divine powers.⁽²⁴⁾ A passage such as that already quoted from Deut. xxxiii. 7, "Hear,

O Memra of God, the voice of Judah's prayer," is to be explained, by supposing that the Memra is artificially inserted here to avoid the anthropomorphism, or (and this is a more likely solution) that the Memra here is the Deity in His aspect of Love, God as the receiver of the prayer of the just.

Bearing this in mind, it is rather surprising to find that Philo is almost less Jewish in his doctrine of God than the author of the Gospel of St. John. Philo in many a memorable passage boldly declares his Logos to be an "Intercessor," a "Paraclete" of humanity. In the rare cases in which the Memra is found to bear such a sense, the passages are of not much importance. And as for the sections in the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus is depicted in an intercessory rôle, these are shown as having a decidedly Rabbinic colouring. In note 36 in Chapter III. it has been shown how close is the correspondence between the ideas of the opening verse of the Fourth Gospel, and the many Rabbinical sayings about the eternity and pre-existence of the Torah. But even more pronounced is the correspondence between the ideas of both prologue and body of that Gospel, with the theological import of the Targumic Memra. In the prologue the "Word" is the essence of the immanent God in the universe and man. It is the agent and quickening spirit in creation, the life of all that lives and the light of all that shines. In some of the most striking declarations of Paul there is the very same conception in regard to the Messiah (Christ). Thus, "Through him are all things" (Rom. xi. 36). He is "Life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45). "Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). His reign is co-extensive with history. He is "the first-born of all creation." He is "before all things, and in him all things hold together" (Col. i. 15, 17).

Now, what are the theological connotations which are assigned to the Memra in the Targumim? The examples adduced, prove that the Memra points to a Divine manifestation in the affairs of the world, that in the mind of the old-world Targumic author, it expressed the unfailing and infallible Presence of a Godhead who is mercy and wisdom and power and love all in glorious combination, revealing themselves in all the chequered incidents of the life of Israel, in order to sustain God's people in their upward path towards righteousness. It is with teaching of this nature, that the Fourth Gospel seems to accord. Of course, I assume that the modern critical view of the Fourth Gospel is the correct one, viz. that it is a book written with a theological, rather than a historical, purpose, that it is a subjective interpretation of an idea, or series of ideas, rather than an objective presentation, a chronicle of events.

I will now take some parts of the Gospel in detail. The remark in i. 1, "The Word was with God, and the Word was God," so far from lending itself to the Christological interpretation of the identity between God and Jesus, seems to aim at conveying an idea just the reverse. It has been shown from our study of both Shechinah and Memra, that although the Rabbis personified these terms, speaking with the greatest freedom of them as the visible manifestations of Deity in the objective world, they yet left no stone unturned to prevent any belief in anything but the unique and incomparable unity of God. The Gospel seems to bring out just this insistence on the Divine unity, "The Word was with God, and the Word was God. The Word was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made." It is an exact reproduction of the Rabbinic

emphasis upon everything having been made by the "Ma'amar," based on the Psalmist's declaration, "For He spake, and it was" (Psalm xxxiii. 9), with the proviso that this "Ma'amar" must not detract one iota from the absolute Unity of Deity. The Gospel's allusions to the metaphor of light in the next few verses seem to be a further harping on the same Midrashic string. The manifold figurative portrayal of the Shechinah as Light has already been mentioned. The ideas of "the Word made flesh" (i. 14) and "the only begotten of the Father" (*ibid.*) seem also to be an echo of mystical statements found in Rabbinic thought. In T. B. Pesahim 54a we get an enumeration of seven persons or things which were created before the world came into existence. These are (1) the Torah, which is called "the firstling of His way" (Prov. viii. 22); (2) the throne of glory which is "established of old" (Psalm xciii. 2); (3) the sanctuary: "From the beginning is the place of our sanctuary" (Jer. xvii. 12); (4) the garden of Eden (Rabbinical interpretation of סְדָרָה in Gen. ii. 8); (5) Gehenna: "Tophet is ordained of old" (Isaiah xxx. 33); (6) Repentance: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world" . . . Thou saidst, "Return, ye children of men" (Psalm xc. 2-3); (7) the name of the Messiah: "Before the sun His name sprouts forth as Yinnon, the Awakener" (Psalm lxxii. 17 Rabbinical interpretation).⁽²⁵⁾ This pre-existence * "of the name of the Messiah" has

* It is worth while comparing this Rabbinic enumeration of seven pre-existent things with the N.T. Apocalypse passages, such as i. 4, "And from the seven spirits which are before His throne," and iv. 5, "And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God." That the Apocalypse in its present form can be traced to a number of sources more or less loosely held together in a mechanical union, seems to be the opinion of the best modern German scholars, such as Pfeiderer, Weizsäcker, Spitta, etc. [although Swete in his edition of the *Apocalypse* (Macmillan, 1907) seems to argue for a unity of authorship]. And they also agree in this, viz. that many of these sources are Jewish. [Cp. e.g. a phrase like, "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we shall have sealed the servants

a strong bearing on the Gospel idea under consideration. In John viii. 58 Jesus says, "Before Abraham was, I am." One can clearly see then, that the "Word"

of our God on their foreheads" (vii. 3); the idea of "sealing the servants of God" is the Talmudic idea found in T. B. Rosh Hoshana 16b זצרים בם ותתבם לאלהר לחיים [בְּנָבִים וַתֵּתֶת בָּם לְאֱלֹהִים לְחַיִם]. The succeeding verse (vi. 6), "And before the throne, as it were a glassy sea like unto crystal," seems to have affinity with the Rabbinic seven things before the creation of the world, in so far as it is clearly reminiscent of the earliest verses of the first chapter of Genesis, where we find the waters above the firmament answering to the waters below it. Beyond these upper waters, therefore, lay the throne of God, which pre-existed to the universe (cp. for same idea, Book of Enoch xiv. 9, *Secrets of Enoch*, edit. Charles, p. 4). There is an interesting allusion to these seven pre-existences in the Syriac *Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, edited from MSS. and translated by Dr. Rendel Harris (Cambridge University Press, 1909). It occurs in Ode iv. thus: "For Thy sanctuary Thou hast designed before Thou didst make other places; that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself." Dr. Harris says (p. 91): "The writer of the Psalm if not of Jewish origin is, at least, Jewish in sympathy; he holds the Jewish belief that the sanctuary at Jerusalem was older than the world in which it stood; it was, according to Rabbinic teaching, prior to all the created things." What called forth the Psalm, may be, according to Dr. Harris, "some unknown movement to carry on the Jewish worship outside the desolated and proscribed sanctuary, or the closing of the Jewish Temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, which was, perhaps, itself in the first instance built under the pressure of the situation which resulted in the desecration of the Temple at Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes." In this Ode again there is an allusion to sealing: "For Thy seal is known; and Thy creatures know it; and Thy [heavenly] hosts possess it; and the elect archangels are clad with it." This compares well with the N.T. Apocalypse passage (vii. 3) quoted above, which, as we said there, has decided Rabbinic affinities. It is hard to see why Dr. Harris should so emphatically deny the possibility of a Jewish authorship of this Ode in the collection. It may be true enough that, as he says, "there are no Scripture references in the Ode." But the whole style breathes the spirit of the O.T. and the Rabbinical writings.

Since writing the foregoing I have had the opportunity of reading Harnack's critical review of Rendel Harris's work, entitled *Ein jüdisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1910). Harnack's thesis is that the Odes emanate from a Jewish hand, and have received Christian interpolations here and there. While admitting, as he does (see p. 29), that more than one hand has been at work on this particular Ode ("So dass man schwer glauben kann, dass die beiden Stücke ursprünglich eine Einheit gebildet haben"), he does not so severely exclude the Jewish possibility as R. Harris throughout does.

During the interval between the publication of Harnack's work and the present date (1912) this scholar's views have been the subject of considerable discussion. The main current of learned opinion flows in the direction of Rendel Harris's conclusions, that the Odes are Christian rather than Jewish. Thus, in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January 1912, Father Conolly, in an able examination of the Odes, maintains that they are ENTIRELY Christian. In the *Expositor* for January 1912, Professor Wensinck of Utrecht argues for the Christian view by a comparison between the Odes and some points in the writings of Ephraem. In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for January 1912,

which was "in the beginning," and afterwards "was made flesh" and became the Christ, is an echo of the Rabbinic teaching about the pre-existence of Messiah.⁽²⁶⁾ The idea of sonship in relation to God, is developed in Rabbinical literature on the basis of many statements in the Old Testament, and is quite free from any theological or dogmatic significance. It is a Hebrew idiom, which conveys nothing more than the truth of the spirituality of man. Every Israelite, every member of the human race, enjoys God's fatherhood ; it is "spirit" and not physical descent which puts man in the filial relation to his Father in heaven. But there is this exception, viz. that in certain passages in Rabbinic literature, the Messiah is singled out for special sonship. Thus T. B. Sukkah 52a makes God address Messiah, son of David, in the words of Psalm ii. 7, 8, "Thou art my Son, ask of me, etc." (cp. also Genesis Rabba xliv. 8). Similarly, the "Son" of Psalm lxxx. 17 is rendered by the Targum as "King Messiah."

It seems to be just this exceptional usage of son in a Messianic sense, that was adopted by the Fourth Gospel, and made the basis of a dogma which has had the most far-reaching effects for Christianity. But can we go further, and give a Rabbinic authorship to the special phrase "Only begotten Son," used more than once in the Fourth Gospel ? In his *Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung*, Professor Bacher shows how the Hebrew root בָּרִא is frequently used in Rabbinical literature as a synonym for בָּרִיךְ (chosen, elect).⁽²⁷⁾ The Gospel translation "only begotten Son"

Professor Montgomery has a paper on "The Quotations from the New Testament in the *Odes of Solomon*." Curiously enough, where Harnack and Spitta discover essentially Jewish teaching, Montgomery finds citations from the New Testament. Further, he tries to show that the quotations from the Old Testament, are chiefly drawn from those books with which the early Church was most familiar, viz. the Psalms and certain portions of the Wisdom Literature.

corresponds to the Hebrew תְּמִימָה used in this specialised sense. So that the phrase "only begotten Son" may possess no doctrinal connotation.

Although I would not go to the length of Güdemann,* who says (in *Monatsschrift*, 1893, pp. 345-356) that the whole of the Fourth Gospel was written by a born Jew, I do maintain that it is the work of one who was thoroughly saturated with the Jewish Apocalyptic as well as the Palestinian Rabbinic teachings in the first century A.D., and being saturated with these teachings, one of his objects was to demonstrate, that a belief in the angelic lore of the Jews, as well as the prevalent ideas about God's Shechinah and "Word," does not in any degree imply dualism of Deity. Judaism's foremost truth that "God is one" is an unassailable stronghold. But, lest this oneness of God might lead to a too narrow and exclusive view of the Divine transcendentalism of some of the Biblical writers, he aimed at showing, by means of a string of deftly-worded parables and striking epigrams, all clustering round the name of Jesus, the reality of the other aspect of God, viz. the immanent aspect. Thus, the Messiahship of Jesus sinks comparatively into the background, and there is found, instead, an exposition of God's fatherhood (vi. 29-46, xiv. 2, xv. 8-10, etc.), through which alone life, salvation, and resurrection

* Güdemann's view is also that of the late Bishop Westcott in his recently published *Gospel according to St. John* (Murray, 2 vols). He says: "The conclusion towards which all the lines of inquiry converge remains unshaken, that the Fourth Gospel was written by a Palestinian Jew. . . ." But Schmiedel in his newest book, *The Johannine Writings* (Black), declares it to be the work of some unknown Ephesian. Harnack, again, in his recently edited *Odes of Solomon*, swings back to the older view of its Jewish origin. He says (p. 106): "dieser Johannes mag, bevor er Christ wurde, bereits ein jüdischer Mystiker gewesen sein."

Since writing the above, I see that in the opinion of the writer of the Introduction to the Gospel of St. John in the *Century Bible* (Rev. J. A. M'Clymont), the Gospel is the work of "some Jewish Christian who was thoroughly conversant with the state of things in Jerusalem and Palestine" at that epoch.

are obtainable.* This all-embracing, all-permeating Divinity in the affairs of life is, as has been already shown, the burden of the message of a large part of Rabbinic theology. Inge, speaking of the permanent value of the Logos-Christology, says (quoting from the late Prof. Wallace of Oxford): "The Veil is rent away which in days of ignorance hid God and made Him an unknown God; clad Him in thick darkness

* Harnack in his essay on the *Odes of Solomon* asserts: "So ist er für die höhere Kritik des Johannes Evangeliums epochemachend, weil diese jüdischen Oden (nicht erst die christliche Bearbeitung) bereits all wesentlichen Stücke der johanneischen Theologie samt ihrer religiösen Klangfarbe enthalten. Die Tat des 'Johannes' sie mit Jesus Christus zu verknüpfen und sie zu noch gröserer Erhabenheit und Werbekraft zu bringen, bleibt gewaltig genug; aber sie erschöpft sich auch ganz wesentlich hierin" (Vorrede v.). Thus, the Fourth Gospel is, as I in these pages have maintained, a Christianised version of Jewish mystical ideas which were afloat in Palestine in the early Christian centuries. Harnack on p. 118 asks the question, "What do we learn from these Odes on the subject of the history of the rise of Christianity?" And he replies, "Wir lernen aus den Oden (1) in einem entfernten Zweige des Judentums einen religiösen Individualismus kennen, wie wir ihn bisher kaum geahnt haben. . . . Dass dieser Individualismus in seiner Freiheit von allem Mythischen . . . und Ceremoniösen in seiner spirituellen Reinheit und in seiner relativen Loslösung von der nationalen Religion eine wichtige Vorstufe des Christentums ist, ist klar. Zwischen den jüngsten kanonischen Psalmen der Weisheit und den Psalmen Solomos und den Testamenten der XII. Patriarchen einerseits und dem Individualismus eines Paules, Johannes, Ignatius, anderseits finden diese Oden ihre Stätte." It is refreshing to hear, from so great an authority as Harnack, that the Gospel which, among the four, is by consent the most spiritual, was inspired by some "entfernten Zweige des Judentums." If this be true, who shall henceforward be bold enough, be unhistorical enough, to speak of Pharisaism as though it were all formalism, ceremonialism, nationalism, etc., with no thought for the inwardness which must be a vital constituent of all religions? (2) Harnack says that we learn from these Odes that "die Conceptionen von Licht, Wahrheit, Leben, Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung, von Erkenntniß und Unvergänglichkeit, von Prädestination und neuer Geburt (bis zu Formulierungen hin, die als Eigentum des 'Johannes' bzw. auch des Apostels Paulus gelten und daher als Erzeugnisse des Geistes Christi eschienen) nicht 'christlich' sondern bereits vorchristlich sind." And by "vorchristlich" he implies, as he says further on (p. 119) "Es hat, wie wir nun gelernt haben, im Spätjudentum einen Kreis von Mystikern gegeben, der in den religiösen Erfahrungen und Ideen lebte, die die Grundlage der johanneischen Theologie bilden." Harnack will not even have it that the Logos of the Prologue of the Gospel is essentially Greek, and apart from the Prologue, says he, there is nothing really Hellenic about the Gospel. What the author of the Fourth Gospel has done is to make Christ "die persönliche Verkörperung" of these current Jewish mystical notions; and he has preserved as we have maintained, the strict Jewish monotheistic teaching. Harnack's view as to the Odes has been disputed, but this does not destroy the force of his opinion as to the Jewish associations of the Fourth Gospel.

and terrors of the mount, saw Him invisible in excess of light, and heard Him whispering indistinctly in the separate events of history, a factor incalculable, mysterious, awful.”⁽²⁸⁾ We might apply exactly the same phraseology to the revolution effected in the religious life of the Jew, once the immanent view of God, as expressed in the Kabbalah, gained the ascendancy in the Middle Ages over the exaggerated dry formalism of Talmudical dialectics.⁽²⁹⁾ And the Kabbalah is, after all, but a normal and legitimate outgrowth of the old Rabbinic literature. The Shechinah of the Talmud, the Metatron⁽³⁰⁾ of the Gaonic-mystical literature, the “active intelligence” of Gabirol and Maimonides, the “Ten Sephiroth”⁽³¹⁾ of the Kabbalists are all warp and woof of one and the same texture—they are homogeneous elements of Jewish thought concerning the Divine Immanence.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

(1) See Levy N. H. Wörterbuch and M. Jastrow’s Dictionary. A Targumic synonym for Memra is “Dibbur,” which is rarely found. When found it is nearly always in the Pseudo-Jonathan and not Onkelos, e.g. Genesis xxviii. 10, “וְנִבְאַלְתָּה וְנִבְאַרְתָּה,” “For the reason that the ‘Dibbur’ was desirous of speaking with him.” Similarly Exodus xxxiii. 11, Numbers vii. 89, all in Pseudo-Jonathan. Cp. Talmudic phrases like “Out of every ‘Dibbur,’ which escapes from God’s mouth, an angel is created” (T. B. Haggigah 14a); “The Dibbur was not with Moses” (B. Bathra 121b) until the rebellious Israelites had perished (Deuteronomy ii. 16).

(2) R. Jeremiah (or, according to another version, R. Hiya bar Abba) said, “The Targum to the Pentateuch was composed by the proselyte Onkelos at the dictation of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (T. B. Megillah 3a).” Jonathan ben Uziel is named as Hillel’s most prominent pupil (Sukkah 28a; B. Bathra 134a). There is an elaborate article on this interesting but difficult subject by Bacher in vol. xii. of the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*. See also M. Friedmann, *Onkelos and Akylas*, pp. 96-104. Introduction to *עֲמֹתָן*, by Dr. N. M. Adler; Field’s great work, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Oxford, 1875, is a mine of information for this knotty problem concerning the relations between the Greek and Aramaic

(3) In the Targumim, one finds not only the exact reproductions of Rabbinic translations of verses of the Bible, but also Halachas, as e.g. in Deut. xxi. 8, "Be merciful, O Lord, unto Thy people Israel," which Onkelos renders: "The priests shall say, Be merciful, O Lord, unto Thy people Israel," which is a Mishna to be found in T. B. Sotah 46a.

(4) Of course Memra does not always carry a theological connotation. It sometimes means the ordinary words of men in ordinary speech. For instance, "according to the commandment of Pharaoh" (Genesis xlvi. 21) is given as, "By the Memra of Pharaoh"; or "He will not hearken unto our voice" (Deut. xxi. 20) is rendered, "He will not receive our Memra."

(5) Maimonides seems to have taken this view, for which he was severely criticised by Nahmanides in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Genesis xlvi. 4). Abarbanel, however, in his *Commentary on the Moreh* defends him. In chap. xxvii. of his *Moreh*, Maimonides says: "Onkelos the proselyte, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Hebrew and Chaldaic languages, made it his task to oppose the belief in God's corporeality. Accordingly any expression employed in the Pentateuch in reference to God and in any way implying corporeality, he paraphrases in consonance with the context." The implication here is, that the periphrasis with Memra would have, as its sole object, the avoidance of anthropomorphism. This is shown by Nahmanides to be false. Weber in his *Jüdische Theologie*, 1897, pp. 180-184, attempts a sketch of the subject of anthropomorphism, but his points of view are too biased for acceptance. Maybaum's work, *Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos* (Breslau, 1870) sets up elaborate rules for guidance in our understanding of the subject, but they do not seem to hold good always. The difficulty is, as Bacher points out, that there is no uniformity in the printed versions of the Targumim. It is often impossible to say whether a word found in one version of Onkelos does not really belong to another version of Pseudo-Jonathan and *vice versa*.

(6) If the sole object were the avoidance of anthropomorphism, says Nahmanides, it should have been rendered either "*וְיָדָךְ יְהוָה*" or "*וְיָדָךְ*" "*וְיָמָר*" or "*וְיִמְרֶא*".

(7) Similarly in Genesis viii. 21, "And the Lord smelt a sweet savour," the Targum has, "And the Lord accepted with pleasure, etc." After all, one cannot see less anthropomorphism in saying that "God accepts" than that "God smells."

(8) Chapter lxvi. of the *Moreh* (Part I.) is devoted to an exposition of the phrase "finger of God" in Exodus xxxi. 18. Maimonides sees here the difficulty of maintaining the theory he had previously laid down. Pushed for an explanation, he says that the phrase "finger of God" is identical with "written by the word of God," and if this latter phrase had been used it would have been equal to "written by the will and desire of God" ("*וְיַפְעֵל*"). But surely this is merely a case of begging the question! Once you interpret these human acts of God in terms of will or desire on the part of God that such and such should take place, then the whole structure of the problem of anthropomorphism is blown away like a house of cards! Maimonides goes on to admit that "it would have

been more reasonable to say ‘written by the Memra of God.’” And he then suggests that just as the “stars in the spheres” were made by the direct will of God, not “by means of an instrument,” the writing may also have been produced by His direct will, not “by means of an instrument.” This is in accordance with Maimonides’ theory of distinctions between things created by the immediate Divine action and those fashioned by what he calls אָור נְבָרָא, “a light specially created for the purpose.” It is just this latter that is the butt of Nahmanides’ attack, since Nahmanides holds the view of the presence and work of God in all parts of creation : the immanent view.

(9) See *Moreh* I. chap. xlviii. Speaking of the Targumic usage of פִּירָא = “to see,” Maimonides remarks, “His renderings vary in a remarkable manner, and I am unable to discern his principle or method.” Maimonides eventually frames certain principles which he imagines Onkelos to pursue, but these he confesses are weakened by obvious exceptions to the rules. His remark, “It appears to me that in these passages there is a mistake which has crept into the copies of the Targum, since we do not possess the Targumim in the original manuscript of Onkelos,” is an excellent anticipation of the modern critical reading of Targumic literature. An instance of the difficulties which the student meets on this head is well afforded by the following. Nahmanides (Genesis xlvi. 4) quotes the verse, “The Lord thy God He passeth before thee” (Deut. xxxi. 3) as being rendered literally by Onkelos. But this is not the case in the versions we have. In Onkelos the Memra is inserted, Pseudo-Jonathan has Shechinah. This shows editing. There can also be no doubt that the Targumim contain many extraneous elements (see Professor Bacher’s article “Targum” in vol. xii. of *Jewish Encyclopaedia*).

(10) This remark of Nahmanides is modelled on Daniel xii. 10, בְּנֵי מַשְׁכִּילִים, בְּנֵי מַקְבִּילִים. The “Maskilim” is a title given to the Kabbalists (מַקְבִּילִים) who studied the *Sefer Yetzirah*, a Mishna-like text-book of the Gaonic period, containing mystic doctrines of God’s relation to the universe. Nahmanides frequently uses another expression בְּנֵי רָא in a similar sense. This is because the Kabbalah is called רָא (“hidden wisdom”) and the initials of these two words make up the word בְּנֵי. The phrase is an ingenious adaption of the two words in Ecclesiastes ix. 11.

(11) See Weiss, *Dor* iv. 12 *et seq.*; Perles in *Monatsschrift* vii. 81 *et seq.*; Shechter’s essay on Nahmanides (in *Studies in Judaism*, i pp. 120 *et seq.*).

(12) It is interesting to note how Nahmanides reduces Maimonides’ argument about Shechinah to a *reductio ad absurdum*. The latter maintains that Shechinah is a mystical kind of light—אָור or בְּנֵי נְבָרָא—a mystical halo of glory which is something external to the Deity (*Moreh* i. 27). If this were true, says he, how can the rendering of Jonathan b. Uziel on Ezekiel iii. 12, בָּרוּ קְדֹשָׂה הִיא, be justified? The “בָּרוּ קְדֹשָׂה” and the “בְּנֵי נְבָרָא” would be external to one another; if the former means God, as it certainly does, then the latter cannot. It must mean some adjunct to God. How then can the term בָּרוּ, “blessed be,” be applied here? To invoke a blessing upon an

adjunct to the Deity is equivalent to idolatry, and surely Ezekiel could not be guilty of this offence?

(13) Nahmanides here quotes a passage from Genesis Rabba on this verse, where R. Abba b. Kahana says that the peculiar usage of the Hithpael הִתְפַּאֵל (and not the Kal הִלְבָד) shows that it is an allusion to the going away of the Shechinah on account of Adam's sin. But he (Nahmanides) disagrees with this view, and says that it is an allusion to the revelation of the Shechinah. Cp. Onkelos on Isaiah vi. 8.

(14) Cp. Onkelos on Jeremiah xxxix. 18, xl ix. 11.

(15) Cp. the remark in Exodus Rabba i. 29 where an opinion states, with regard to Moses smiting the Egyptian, "he pronounced the name of God over him and slew him." In Song of Songs Rabba i. 4 the Israelites at Mount Sinai are said to have received a wonderful rod on which the name יְהוָה (Tetragrammaton) was engraved. The legends of the negotiations between Solomon and the demon Asmodeus contain allusions to the powers exercised by the Divine Name.

(16) The subject also proved a fascinating one to the mediæval Jewish philosophers. Ibn Ezra on Exodus iii. 15 has an elaborate excursus in which he characteristically brings his astronomical, mathematical, and grammatical powers to the elucidation of the subject. Jehuda Ha-Levi devotes much space to it in the *Kusari* (iv. 1-3); so does Maimonides, in his *Moreh* i. 61, also in his *Yad*; section "Yesode-ha-Torah," vi. 2.

(17) The names of the angels were a favourite study of the Essenes. See *J.Q.R.*, 1898, pp. 1-45, for Conybeare's translations of the Testament of Solomon. All sorts of magical cures were effected by a knowledge of these names. (See Blau's work, *Das alt-jüdische Zauberwesen*, *passim*.) The *Alphabet* of R. Akiba, which is a Midrash on the names of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, treats also very largely of the mysteries of the names of God. In his *Beth-Hamidrash*, iii. 12-49, 50-64, Jellinek has published the two extant versions of the *Alphabet*. The mediæval Kabbalists never tired of harping on the theme. What Graetz (Eng. trans. iv. p. 5) says of the Kabbalistic system of Abraham Abulafia (1240-1291) is true of all these systems generally: "To decompose the words of Holy Writ and especially of the all-hallowed Name of God, to use these letters as independent notions (*Notaricon*) . . . these were the means of securing communion with the Spirit-world."

(18) Cp. Onkelos on 1 Kings viii. 50; Isaiah i. 2, 16; Hosea v. 7, vi. 7.

(19) Nahmanides on Exodus xxxiii. 14, which belongs to the same context, says, "It is impossible to understand this passage unless one has previously acquainted himself with the esoteric doctrines of the Torah."

(20) See Marti, *Isaiah* lxiii. 14; also Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*

(21) It is curious that in Numbers xv. 31, "For He hath despised the word of the Lord," whereas Onkelos uses Memra, the Jerusalem Targum gives נְקֻדָּת מֹרֶם, "the first Commandment," alluding to the first of the Ten Commandments, which was infringed by this act of blasphemy, the punishment for which is "cutting off" according to Rabbinic law (*T. B. Sanhedrin* 64b). Neither Targum seems, however, to attach any theological sense to the "Word."

(22) Cp. similar usage of בָּרוּךְ שֵׁם יְהוָה in 1 Samuel xv. 11.

(23) Of course the Targumim use other expressions in a very similar significance to Memra. These are (1) Shechinah, as I have frequently pointed out. (2) Yekara, e.g. Pseudo-Jon. xii. 23 (cp. this with xii. 29; in latter it is Yekara, whereas in the former, it is Memra which smites). Onkelos and Pseudo-Jon. on Genesis xxviii. 13, xvii. 22 (on this latter Nahmanides makes the mystical remark "that the Patriarchs are the chariot of God," and ends up with the phrase בָּרוּךְ שֵׁם יְהוָה, which is the usual indication of Nahmanides that he is drawing a Kabbalistic interpretation from the words of Scripture). (3) Yekar Shechinah (usually in Onkelos it is spelt יְקָרָה, but in Pseudo-Jon. it is also frequently יְקָרָה). See Onkelos, Numbers x. 33, 34, Pseudo-Jon. xiv. 14; also Exodus xxxiii. 22 (Jerushalmi), Leviticus xvi. 2 (Pseudo-Jon.), etc.

(24) Travers Herford in his *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, London, 1903, points out how the polemics of the Rabbis in the period of the rise of Christianity were directed mainly against dualism (page 395).

(25) Sometimes as many as nine pre-existent things are enumerated, the two additional ones being (a) the Patriarchs, (b) Israel (based on Psalm lxxiv. 2, "Thy congregation which Thou hast created from the beginning"). Some sources mention also a tenth—the Holy Land, "the בָּרוּךְ שֵׁם יְהוָה first of the dusts of the world" (Proverbs viii. 26 curiously literal rendering of the Hebrew). See for all these T. B. Nedarim 39b; Genesis Rabba i. 3; Pirke R. Eliezer iii.; Midrash Tillim Psalm lxxiv.; Sifre Deut. 37, etc.

In Apocalyptic literature, especially the Slavonic Enoch (R. H. Charles, 1896), the Apocalypse of Baruch (*idem* 1896), and 2 Esdras there are many parallel sayings.

(26) The Spirit of God which moved upon the face of the waters (Gen. i. 2) is the Spirit of the Messiah (Genesis Rabba viii. 1). The Pesikta Rabbati (Friedmann's edition, Vienna, 1880), p. 161b, referring to Psalm xxxvi. 9, "For with Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light," as well as to Genesis i. 4, says, "God beheld the Messiah and His deeds before the creation of the world, but He hid Him and His generation under His throne of glory." In the Slavonic Enoch there are several statements to the effect that Messiah was hidden and preserved by God (xlvi. 6-7, xlvi. 1-3, etc.). For this idea of "hiding" cp. what is said in T. B. Haggigah 12a about God hiding the primæval light for the benefit of the saints in the future time. Here again we have, by the way, a linking up of the ideas of Light and Messiah.

(27) For this usage of מְנֻחָה see Levy's and Jastrow's Dictionaries. Onkelos on Genesis xxvi. 10 renders מְנֻחָה by מְנוּחָה, "the distinguished one among the people" (followed by Rashi *ad loc.*). See also Genesis Rabba xcix. 11, "Dan shall judge his people as one (מְנוּחָה) of the tribes of Israel," i.e. כָּדוֹן כָּבוֹד, "as the most prominent, elect, among the tribes, viz Judah." The term מְנוּחָה applied to God means "the Distinguished Name," i.e. the Tetragrammaton which is marked off by a special sanctity from the other Divine names. In T. B. Sanhedrin 60a Rashi distinctly says that it is an equivalent of מְנוּחָה. S. Munk in

his translation of Maimonides' *Moreh* (vol. i. chap. lxi.) is of opinion that the שֵׁמֶן הַמָּזִים meant "le nom de Dieu distinctement prononcé," but this is very improbable (see Dr. Friedlander's note in vol. i. of his *Guide of the Perplexed*, p. 226). It has been pointed out by (among others) Bacher in his *Terminologie*, p. 71, and in his article "Shem-Ha-Meforash" in vol. xi. of the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, that the Sifri on Numbers vi. 27 has "Shem-Ha-Meforash," whereas on the same passage T. B. *Sotah* 38a has "Shem-Ha-Meyuhad." This goes a long way towards disproving the view of Munk. There is a similar usage of "Yahid" in the Babylonian Talmud as e.g. *Yoma* 23a, "the Yahid may eat and drink as soon as it gets dark." Here it signifies "the learned," those specially distinguished for their religious and intellectual pre-eminence. In *Ta'anith* 10a there occurs the remark, "It is not every one who wishes to make himself a Yahid that may do so." The sense is similar.

(28) *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, p. 91. Inge's view of the Fourth Gospel is excellently summed up in his words: "The life, death, and resurrection of the Word of God were not a solitary event, not an unique portent, but the supreme vindication of an universal law. It is exemplified and re-enacted in little, in every human soul among the elect" (p. 82).

(29) This must not be taken to mean that the Kabbalah superseded the Talmud. Both were cultivated side by side, as is proved by the fact that such eminent Talmudists as Nahmanides, Joseph Caro, Isserles, and others were students and admirers of Kabbalah. There need be no natural repugnance between these two departments of Jewish scholarship. Wherever the two are antagonistic to one another, as was the case with the followers of Sabbatai Tsevi (1626-1676), and later with the Baal-Shem and his pupils, who founded the sect known as the "Hassidim," the movement was largely an artificially engineered one, becoming ultimately a party matter, and degenerating, in many instances, into an unmeaning and unlovely extravagance in religious belief and practice. (See Shechter's essay on "Chassidim" in *Studies in Judaism*, i. pp. 52-56.)

(30) References to Metatron are to be found in Talmudic and Midrashic literature as well as in the Apocalyptic Midrashim, which have been collected by Jellinek in his *Beth-Hamidrash*, and in the *Zohar*. He, more than any other of the vast hierarchy of semi-Divine beings, seems to have been invested with cosmic functions and usually called "prince of the world." (See T. B. *Hullin* 60a.) There are some interesting remarks on the subject in a *Tosefoth* on T. B. *Hullin* 60a where the author rejects the view that Metatron is identical with Enoch, as held by some authorities (cp. the rôle played by Enoch in the *Apocrypha*), and refers to a quaint passage in the Liturgy for the last day of Tabernacles (*רְאֵנוֹת נְאֵבוֹת*), which reads, "Metatron the mighty prince, he who was changed from flesh into fire, the giver of instruction to the children of him who was handed over to the fire [Abraham]." The phrase "giver of instruction" is an allusion to T. B. *Aboda Zarah* 3b, where Metatron is described as sharing with God in the work of giving religious instruction to the school children. With this groundwork of

wonder-working, it is easy to understand how, in mediæval Jewish mysticism, Metatron came to play a prominent part not unmixed with a considerable amount of pure superstition. Bousset on pp. 347-348 has some interesting remarks on the relations between Metatron, Enoch, and the Christian ideas of "son of man," "son of God," etc. etc.

(31) The Ten Sephiroth are part of the doctrine of "emanation," which is the corner-stone of the mediæval Kabbalah. It figures prominently in the philosophy of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonists, and was adopted by many mediæval Jewish thinkers, e.g. Ibn Gabirol, as the basis of their theological speculations. Although belonging, as I have said, to the same order of thought as the Talmudic Shechinah or Memra, it marks a distinct advance upon them in so far that it is a carefully worked-out philosophical idea. It maintains that God being unchangeable, He cannot be regarded as the Creator of existent beings, since the act of creating involves change. Therefore the world is the result of the "emanations," the successive outflowings from the Deity. The world and mankind are thus an embodiment, a revelation of God.

CHAPTER XIV

THE HOLY SPIRIT

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS *

In the Biblical, Apocryphal, and Rabbinical literature three expressions are sometimes used as synonyms and sometimes with differing connotations, viz. : (1) Spirit, (2) the Spirit of God, (3) the Holy Spirit. The two former abound in the Old Testament both in its pre-exilic and post-exilic books ; and also in the Apocrypha. They are not commonly met with in the Talmud and Midrash. It is the "Holy Spirit" that is found in these latter writings. It is found occasionally also in the Apocrypha ; but in the Old Testament there are only two references to it. These are (1) Psalm li. 11, "Cast me not away from Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me" ; (2) Isaiah lxiii. 10, 11, "But they rebelled, and vexed His Holy Spirit. . . . Where is He that put His Holy Spirit within him ?"

It is necessary to know something of the relationship between these three terms, because, belonging as they do, to differing branches of Jewish literature, they stand for different phases of thought and doctrine.

Spirit is *רֹוח* and in the LXX *πνεῦμα*. But the LXX oftentimes has another rendering, and this gives us the clue to the many-sided interpretation which must be

* My object in this chapter is rather to bring out the Rabbinic (and Targumic) methods of interpreting the O.T. allusions to Spirit.

placed on the usage of Spirit in the Old Testament. It is sometimes rendered ἀνέμος, sometimes θυμός, sometimes πνοή, and twice by ψυχή.* To go minutely and scientifically into the correlations of these terms, and to examine their relation to the Hebrew synonyms, רוח, נפש, and חם, would require a whole essay to itself—and it is an essay well worth attempting. What I intend doing is, to tabulate the different senses in which the word “Spirit” (רוּחַ) occurs in the O.T., noting some of the most striking characteristics as they occur.

(1) In the mere physical sense of wind. Examples are too numerous and well known to mention.⁽¹⁾ *N.B.*—It ought, however, to be noted here that in the opinion of the Targum and of Ibn Ezra the phrase in Genesis i. 2, “And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,” should be translated, “And a wind of God moved upon the face of the waters.”

The Targum on the passage is, “And a wind from before God blew upon the face of the waters”; and Ibn Ezra’s opinion is סמך הרוח אל ה “בבvero היותו של ה בחרפץ ה” ליבש המים, i.e. “the text makes the wind belong to God, because it was a messenger of His will to dry up the waters,” Ibn Ezra obviously basing his idea on Psalm civ. 4.⁽²⁾ And yet the Rabbinical interpretation would seem to accord rather with the ordinarily accepted rendering “Spirit” and not “wind.”

[This interpretation is given in T. B. Haggigah 12a as : “The Throne of Glory was standing in the air and ‘brooding’ over the face of the water by means of the breath of the mouth of God and by His Word, as a dove that broods over its nest.” In a note on a previous page, I have already dwelt on the mysticism associated with the “Throne” in Rabbinic literature. In his article on “Holy Spirit” in Hastings’ *Dictionary*

* According to Hatch, also αέρα.

of the Bible, Dr. Swete, quoting from Cheyne's *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 322, says that "it is not the wind, but the Divine energy, that is regarded as vitalising the germs which the Divine Word is about to call forth." This is an apt commentary on the Rabbinical view. It gives a rationalistic explanation of the mystical idea about the "Throne brooding" over the chaos of the first Creation.]

(2) From the wide sense of wind as it blows over the universe, it is narrowed down to denote the wind of man's body, *i.e.* the breath; and as breath is the fundamental vital principle, we get the combination רוח חיים, "the spirit or breath of life" (Genesis vii. 15, 22); רוח כל בשר איש, "the spirit of the whole flesh of man" (Job xii. 10). All these senses are purely physical. Particularly noteworthy in this connexion is the expression in Psalm lxxviii. 39, "For He remembered that they were but flesh; a wind [*i.e.* a breath] that passeth away, and cometh not again." Life is a breath. When the breath gives out, so does the life.

(3) The idea of the life-principle in man leads on to the psychological manifestations of that principle. Hence רוח, "Spirit," comes to denote some of the higher aspects of human nature. These are (*a*) the emotional, as *e.g.* Genesis xli. 8, "And it came to pass in the morning, that his spirit was troubled"; Exodus vi. 9, "But they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage"; Proverbs xxv. 28, "As a city that is broken down and without walls, so is he that hath no rule over his spirit." A beautiful simile for the utter desolation which awaits a career of unrestrained passion or emotion! Hosea v. 4, "For the spirit of whoredoms is in the midst of them, and they have not known the Lord." Here the sensual emotion is depicted as the bar to the knowledge of

God. (b) The volitional, as e.g. Deut. ii. 30, "For the Lord thy God hardened his spirit, and made his heart obstinate." The hardening of the "spirit" is the deadening of the volitional capacity. Numbers xiv. 24; "But my servant Caleb, because he had another spirit with him, and hath followed me fully, him will I bring into the land." Here spirit = intention, will. Similarly 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 22 (identical phrase also in Ezra i. 1), "The Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom." The "stirring of the spirit" is the rousing of the beneficent motive in man. Again, in Psalm li. 19, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," we have an allusion to the necessity of the resignation of man's will to the Divine will. And the behaviour of the man whose will leads him into unprofitable paths, is termed in Ecclesiastes i. 14 רעשות רוחה, i.e. "vexation of spirit" (this translation assumes רוחה to be connected with the root רע=evil⁽³⁾: another rendering of the phrase is "feeding on wind"; in this case רוחה has the purely physical sense that I have spoken of, and as is alluded to in Hosea xii. 2, "Ephraim feedeth on wind").⁽⁴⁾

Following on this psychological usage of "spirit" as a phase of the emotional and volitional aspect of mind, we get a compound usage where the word is tacked on to another noun which exactly particularises the nature of the "spirit." For example, "the spirit of wisdom" (Exodus xxviii. 3). This means that department of the emotional or volitional aspect of mind which shows itself in wisdom. "The spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord" (Isaiah xi. 2). According to Marti, the high stage of religious and moral equipment here alluded

to, as characterising the ideal king, will be consequent upon his being filled with that highest spiritual element denoted in the immediately preceding words, "And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him." A similarly high grade of character, brought to pass as the result of a Divine gift, is denoted by the expression "spirit of grace and supplications" in Zechariah xii. 10. And then we get the application of this compound usage of "spirit" to the exactly opposite side of human disposition, viz. the undesirable intentions and emotions. Thus in Numbers v. 14 we read of the "spirit of jealousy." In 1 Samuel xvi. 23, xvii. 10 we read of the "evil spirit." In 2 Chronicles xviii. 22 the "spirit of lying" is spoken of. Isaiah xxix. 10, in a characteristic metaphor, alludes to the pouring out on the people, of the "spirit of deep sleep," upon which Marti makes the comment that here "*רַאֲוֹן* als etwas Materielles gilt." Zechariah xiii. 2 speaks of the cutting off of the prophets and the "spirit of uncleanness," the latter no doubt alluding to the base impulses which prompted the exercise of the prophetic art at the time when the author wrote.⁽⁶⁾

(4) The next upward step in the connotation of "Spirit" in the O.T. is its recognition as a Divine principle in human nature. The preceding senses have been psychological. They correspond to character, motive, impulse, will, intention, in so far as these sway and determine the conduct of men and their relations to one another. We now come to the theological aspect of the word, its bearing on the highest and holiest of the relationships which encompass man, viz. his relationship to the Deity. An appropriate start might be made with the expression in Numbers xxvii. 16, "The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh." As it stands, in its bald literalness, this phrase is hardly

intelligible. But the right meaning is suggested by the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum which rendered it thus: "The 'Memra' of God who rules over the soul of man, and from whom is given the soul-spirit to all flesh." Here we have a clear hint as to the linking up of the Divine with the human spirit. The human spirit belongs to God and is "given" by Him. Being a gift it has to be, at some time or another, restored to its original owner.⁽⁶⁾ And thus the Psalmist is moved to exclaim, "Into Thine hand I commit my spirit,"⁽⁷⁾ while the author of Ecclesiastes xii. 7 speaks of the spirit returning "unto the God that gave it." It is doubtful whether the writer meant to convey some clearly-conceived idea of a personal immortality or of some spiritual resurrection.

(5) This leads to the final inquiry as to the nature and constituent elements of spirit in such recurring expressions as "Spirit of God." It is important, in discussing this subject, to adopt the method of classification. One has to classify the O.T. references to the Divine Spirit in respect of its relations to (a) the nation; (b) the individual; (c) the world.^(8a) In respect of (a) it would be necessary to make subdivisions so as to differentiate between the workings of the spirit in the various representative sections of the nation, as *e.g.* kings, prophets, Messiah, etc. And in the case of (b) investigation would have to distinguish those references where the Spirit is, as it were, fitful, occasional, ecstatic, from those where it is permanent, an internal ethical endowment continuous in its effect.

I shall adopt this classification, but as this whole subject of the spirit in the O.T. is only here introduced in an introductory sense, *i.e.* as opening the way to a better understanding and interpretation of the "Holy

Spirit" as an aspect of the Immanence of God in the Rabbinical writings, I shall only be able to deal with representative aspects of the theme, and cannot attempt to quote all the passages that are to be found.

Take first (*a*) *The Relation of Divine Spirit to the Nation* :—

(1) As inspiring acts of heroism in the Judges, e.g. "And the Spirit of the Lord began to move him [Samson] at times in the camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol" (Judges xiii. 25). The Targum on the passage is wonderfully explanatory וְשׁוֹרָא רֹוחַ קָדֵם הָלֶכֶת כִּי תִּקְפֹּרְתָּה, i.e. "and the spirit of might from before God commenced to strengthen (i.e. fortify) him."⁽⁸⁾ It has a similar rendering of xiv. 6, xv. 14; cp. Judges xi. 29.

(2) As inspiring acts of heroism in the King, e.g. 1 Samuel xi. 6, where Saul helps the men of Jabesh Gilead against Nahash the Ammonite. As an instance of the careful discrimination by the Targum, of the various senses of Spirit, I may mention that whereas here, as in the instance previously quoted, it renders it "Spirit of might," there are several other passages in 1 Samuel where the very same Hebrew phrase is rendered רֹוחַ נְבוּאָה, i.e. "spirit of prophecy." This is the case in x. 6, xvi. 13,⁽⁹⁾ xix. 20, 23, the prophetic aspect of the Spirit being more in accordance with the context.

(3) As inspiring various characters connected with the cult or government of ancient Israel. For example, Exodus xxxi. 3, where it is said of Bezaleel, "And I have filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding . . . to devise cunning works, etc."⁽¹⁰⁾ The correct ordering of the Tabernacle, which was to be, for Israel, the instrument for encompassing the Shechinah in the midst of the nation, was brought about through

this endowment of Bezaleel with the "Spirit." Numbers xi. 17, "And I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and put it upon them" (the seventy elders). The "spirit" here would probably mean the Divine inspiration of the capacity for government, although, according to the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum, it refers to the Spirit of prophecy.⁽¹¹⁾

(4) As an endowment to the nation directly from God, sometimes in a prophetic, and sometimes in a more general, sense, sometimes as a promise for the future, and sometimes as a possession of a past age. Thus, Isaiah xliv. 3, "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." Judging from the preceding half of the verse, and from the parallelism, the Spirit here would have affinity with the "blessing of God," and would probably allude to a combined moral and physical regeneration. According to Marti, it is a physical quickening of the nation and not a spiritual quickening. "Die moralische Regeneration ist nicht erwähnt," says he (*Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 300); and he goes on to compare it with Ezekiel xxxvii. 1-14, which, in his view, is only a promise of material regeneration. But such a standpoint is hardly tenable. To interpret thus, any of the prophecies of Ezekiel which refer to the golden future of exiled Israel, argues insensibility to the underlying spirit of Ezekiel's message. Dillmann is far more to the point. He says (*Der Prophet Jesaja*, Leipzig, 1890, on page 400): "The Spirit and the blessing of God, these are typified by the water which God pours out upon the physically, politically, and spiritually dead nature. The acquiring of the Spirit (*Begeistung*) is for Israel a preparatory condition of the fulfilment of his mission."⁽¹²⁾ The Targum goes to the opposite extreme of Marti's view, and renders "my Holy Spirit," a purely spiritual endowment.

I now take (*b*) *The Relations of the Divine Spirit to Man*. I subdivide as follows:—

(1) It can be an occasional, fitful inspiration. These instances are all more or less prophetic or ecstatic. They abound largely in Ezekiel. Thus in ii. 2, “And the Spirit entered into me when he spake unto me, and set me upon my feet.” The allusion is to one of the ecstatic states into which the prophet lapses at the time of the receipt of the message. In Ezekiel iii. 12, 14, “Then the Spirit took me up, etc.,” there is a curious and weird combination of the spiritual and material aspect of the Spirit: The Divine inspiration which seizes the prophet, acts like a wind to lift him off his feet and remove him from one place to another. In viii. 3 an even more impressive picture on the same theme is drawn. And so xi. 1, 24 and other passages. The Rabbis took an extraordinarily serious view of the mystic experiences of Ezekiel. They treated them as Divine secrets, from which the masses must be held back at all costs. Whether they held that the prophet experienced these strange happenings in actual waking life, or whether they believed them to be his own written description of ecstatic visions that came to him, it is not easy to say. Suffice it to say, that mediæval Rabbinic commentators are unanimous in the latter view.⁽¹⁸⁾ To them, it is a highly coloured description of the inner and outer workings upon man, of the prophetic aspect of God’s Spirit. And modern scholars who see in Ezekiel the “father of Apocalypse,” and a wealth of symbolism which makes his book rank as one of the most original in the sacred literature of Israel, are but corroborating and developing these views along the old lines.

The only other books of the O.T. where we get sudden and ecstatic seizures of the Spirit upon in-

dividuals, are Numbers and 1 and 2 Chronicles. Thus in 1 Chronicles xii. 18 the Spirit comes upon Amasai, "who was chief of the thirty, and he said, Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse." The identity of Amasai is doubtful: he is probably either Amasa or Abishai. But whoever he may have been, it is clear that we have here an instance of a sudden unexpected inrush of the Divine inspiration upon the leader of a troop of warriors. This is the "heroic" aspect of the Spirit previously alluded to. In 2 Chronicles xv. 1-7, closely following upon an account of the wars of Asa, King of Judah, with the Ethiopians, there is a sudden break in the narrative; and we are told that "the Spirit of God came upon Azariah the son of Oded," and he delivers before Asa and the men of Judah a vivid harangue, in which he depicts the results of Israel's apostasy in previous ages, and exhorts them to be henceforth strong and earnest in the service of God. Now, who Azariah the son of Oded was cannot be ascertained. Whether his exhortation can correctly be described as prophecy is open to question on two grounds. Firstly, there is nothing about it, which would place it on a higher pedestal than the address which might be given by any preacher, who wished to present a statesmanlike view of matters to his audience. Secondly, much obscurity clusters round the phrase in verse 8, which reads *וזנבואה עוזד הביא*, which as it stands is an impossible Hebrew construction. And yet we are told that his speech is prompted by the Divine Spirit. We can only infer that this is another instance of the "ecstatic" usage of Spirit. Some momentarily overpowering Divine impulse takes possession of the man at the hour when, in his thinking, there is some high crisis in Israel's affairs.

In the Book of Numbers, the typical example of this fitful, unexplained, and unanticipated appearance in man of the Spirit of God, is Balaam (xxiv. 2). It is under its influence that his intention to curse melts into the ecstatic desire to bless. Can Balaam be designated a prophet? Not from his recorded words or actions in the Bible, unless we regard as prophecy the few passages in which allusions are made, in difficult and ambiguous Hebrew, to far-off future events in the history of Israel.⁽¹⁴⁾ But, strangely enough, the Rabbins thought him a prophet. The Targum reflects their view, by unreservedly rendering the phrase in xxiv. 2 as, "And there rested upon him the Spirit of prophecy from God." What Moses was to Israel (in the prophetic capacity) that was Balaam to the heathens, says the Talmud. In a passage in Numbers Rabba xx. 19 the profession practised by Balaam is thus interestingly graduated. He was first a mere interpreter of dreams. He then proceeded to the higher degree of diviner. From this, he graduated to become a possessor of the Holy Spirit. But he afterwards fell back again to the status of a diviner, as is proved by Joshua xiii. 22, "Balaam also the son of Beor, the soothsayer, did the children of Israel slay with the sword."

(2) Our second subdivision deals with the relations of Divine Spirit to man, where the spirit is a permanent, inborn endowment with a continuous ethical significance. In the Book of Psalms, there is one good instance in cxliii. 10, "Teach me to do Thy will; for Thou art my God: Thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness." This is the A.V. rendering. The Rabbinic commentators invariably translate it, "Thy good spirit shall lead me, etc., " in spite of the difficulty involved in the omission of the definite article in the word. The Targum adopts this view too, and renders

it as "Thy Holy Spirit shall lead me, etc."⁽¹⁵⁾ The Spirit here is the inward possession of God's grace. Thus equipped, the Psalmist feels himself fitted to enter "the land of uprightness," i.e. to take his place among the best, God's elect. There are numerous examples in the Book of Isaiah. A striking instance is xi. 2, where of the Messianic ruler it is said, "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom . . . and of the fear of the Lord." This conception of the Spirit is extremely comprehensive. "It assumes varied forms to meet the varied duties and relations of life to be sustained by the Messianic ruler."⁽¹⁶⁾ It is important, by the way, to notice the generalising of the connotation of prophecy, the widening of the area covered by the word. It is wrong to restrict the term to the capacity of foretelling the future, or to this capacity combined with the gift or endowment of a special kind of inspiration not vouchsafed to ordinary men. As we have seen from more than one preceding quotation from the O.T.—and particularly when viewed in the light of the Targumic translation—prophecy consists in the possession of a higher insight into the will of God, the infusion into man of a more than ordinary power and knowledge and discernment, enabling him to perform what is right, good, and true more effectually than he who lacks the gift. This is the basis of the frequent identification of "Spirit of God" with prophecy. And this is why the Targum here, as in other places, makes the identification. Thus its rendering of xii. 2 is, "And there shall come forth a King from the sons of Jesse, and a Messiah shall spring up from among his sons' sons. And there shall rest upon him the spirit of prophecy from God." The Targum reflects the Rabbins of the Talmud and Midrash. Whether the Rabbins,

however, associated Prophetism with the Messiah, is a moot point which I shall touch on later. But if they did, then it was this spiritual-regenerative sense of the term that they were thinking of. In Isaiah xlii. 1, which is the first of the "Servant" passages, the infusion of the Spirit of God into him is the first condition of his Messianic-prophetic mission. This view assumes that the verses 1-4 are Messianic, as does the Targum, which renders verse 1, "Behold my servant the Messiah, I will draw him near me . . . I will place my Holy Spirit upon him. . . ." And the evident and widespread results of the spirit-imbued servant are that "he shall bring forth judgment ('Mishpat') to the nation." By this phrase "Mishpat" is meant, as Marti points out, the popularisation of religion throughout the world.¹⁷ Thus, the permanent abiding of the Spirit in an individual, brings about its permanent continuance in all men; and this involves a religious and ethical regeneration. But what is the exact significance of Spirit in Isaiah lix. 21, "My Spirit that is upon thee . . . shall not depart out of thy mouth . . ."? It does not seem to bear the same meaning as in the "Servant" passage we have just been examining, where the word has so many prophetic associations. The attempt made by some of the Jewish commentators to range the words "my Spirit" and "my words," as alluding respectively to the Prophets and the Law, is ingenious but far-fetched. The most likely interpretation is that of Duhm, who takes a strictly ethical view of the Spirit here. It is the abiding Spirit "des Gehorsams und der Demut." The Israelitish trait in which, according to the second Isaiah, God finds His chiefest delight is humility, as manifested in obedience to His word.

Leaving Isaiah and coming to the Minor Prophets,

we meet with an outstanding instance of the far-reaching inward and outward ethical efficacy of the Spirit, in Zechariah iv. 6, "This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." The prophetic or Messianic interpretations of spirit do not fit the context here. The allusion is, plainly, to the mystical Divine energy flowing into man, and empowering him to act greatly and overcome superhuman obstacles triumphantly. Unto whom will the spirit here spoken of be vouchsafed? According to Rashi it will be to the Darius who is alluded to in Ezra vi. 9 as having given the decree for the building of the Temple and for supplying the Jews with "wheat, salt, wine and oil," and other things for the purposes of the restored sacrificial ordinances. But the more tenable view, and the one adopted by most commentators ancient and modern, because it is the one which most readily springs from the context, is that Zerubbabel is the person here referred to. The work which Zerubbabel has in hand he will accomplish, not by human might or power, but by the Spirit of God aiding and cheering and invigorating him. There is a distinct air of mysticism about the whole of the passage from Zechariah. The vision of the candlestick is strongly reminiscent of the Biblical as well as Rabbinical portrayal of the light of God, the "Shechinah," the "Kabod," which is all-pervading and universal. The number "seven," the most mystical of all the numerals, is employed with suggestive frequency. The "seven eyes" upon one stone (iii. 9) are the seven eyes of God, which "run to and fro through the whole earth"; in other words, they are God's immanence. Upon the "stone" (iii. 9), which may either be the first or foundation-stone of the Temple, or that alluded to in

iv. 7, which was the final coping-stone of the entire fabric, God will "engrave the graving" (iii. 9). This, taken out of its symbolic trappings, would seem to be a reference to the concentration, the focussing of the Divine Providence within the precincts of the Sanctuary, an idea met with in different ways in both Bible and Talmud.⁽¹⁸⁾ In iv. 2 the candlestick has seven lamps, and "there are seven pipes to each of the seven lamps"; presumably it was through these that the oil flowed from "the bowl upon the top of it" into the lamps for lighting. One is readily tempted to look upon the symbolism of the "bowl upon the top of it" as the supreme and initial fountain of Divinity which pours its beneficence through "the seven pipes," i.e. through the variegated channels of men and creation generally, and becomes embedded in the universe. When, in iv. 6, the riddle is unravelled, and the symbolism is explained to be the Divine promise to Zerubbabel, that whatever he will henceforth accomplish will be the result of the intervention and instrumentality of the "Spirit," we see how readily the contents of the whole of chap. iv. hang together and form one complete picture. The Divine Spirit radiates through the world, and influences the heart of man. In one instance, it incites Zerubbabel to undertakings of the highest ethical and religious importance.

I now turn to (c) *The Relation of the Divine Spirit to the World*. In Genesis i. 2, vi. 17, vii. 15 and many other places in the O.T. the spirit has the physical meaning of wind, breath. In Ecclesiastes it is figuratively carried over to denote vanity. With all these material senses we are not concerned. It is with the ethical usage of the term that we have to do.

The opening chapters of Genesis deal explicitly with the creation and formation of animal and human life, and the phrases “spirit of life” or “breath of life” which we encounter there repeatedly, denote, in their rather naïve ways, the origin of vitality in all sentient beings. In Genesis ii. 7 and ii. 9 the very same word וַיּוּצֶר (“and he formed”) is employed of both the creation of man and the animals. Man in the former passage becomes a “living soul,” and in the latter passage, the very same epithet is applied to every beast of the field and every fowl of the air that was brought to Adam. The allusions are, most probably, to that sense of spirit which denotes the foundation of all created life: the physical basis of vitality, which ranges from its highest point in man to its lowest in the “meanest creature that breathes”—and it is all and equally an emanation from God.⁽¹⁹⁾ But now, how about Genesis vi. 3, “And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever, for that he also is flesh”? Is “spirit” here another term for vitality, or is it a reference to the embodiment of spirituality, the endowment of Divinity in man as a part of creation? The Targum of Onkelos would seem to favour an interpretation on the lines of the former view. It paraphrases thus: “And the Lord said, This wicked generation shall not exist before me for ever, seeing that they are but flesh, and their works corrupt. If they repent I will give them a respite of one hundred and twenty years.” The “spirit” here = the generation, age—a purely physical notion. In the other Targum, however—the Pseudo-Jonathan—we have a far more elaborate paraphrase, which wanders away from the point, but gives a decidedly theological complexion to the subject. “Have I not set my Holy Spirit in them,” it declares, “in order that they may perform good works? But they have

done evil works. Therefore did I give them a respite of one hundred and twenty years, in order that they should repent; but they would not." The spirit here becomes the "Holy Spirit" of Rabbinical literature—a Divine implanting, the incitement to good works, the instigator to repentance; and what a vital part does repentance play in determining man's attitude to God and His Spirit which is outside as well as inside man! ⁽²⁰⁾*

* Curiously enough, Rashi interprets "spirit" in this verse from Genesis as an aspect of God, resident only in God and not in man. From his commentary on the passage one infers that he would thus translate and paraphrase it: "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not complain and strive within me for ever on account of man." *i.e.* there is an argumentation going on within God, which leaves Him in a state of indecision as to whether to spare man or destroy him; this perplexity of spirit within God will not go on for ever, but will be definitely resolved. Quite another line of interpretation is hit upon by Nahmanides, who says as follows: "The reason why God says that His Spirit shall not remain in man for ever, is, that man is, after all, but flesh, like all flesh that creepeth upon the earth, whether fowl, cattle or beast, and he is not fitted to have the Spirit of God within him. The inference we can draw from this subject is, that God made man upright, so that he might be as the ministering angel, by means of the soul with which He dowered him. But lo! man is dragged along after the flesh and after bodily desires, even in the same manner as are the beasts that perish. And therefore the Spirit of God shall no more endure in him, for he is corporeal and not divine; but if they (*i.e.* mankind) repent, then will He prolong their days. This resembles the passage, 'For He remembered that they were but flesh; a *neshamah* that passeth away, and cometh not again' (Ps. lxxviii. 39)." So far Nahmanides. Much of what is said here is cryptic, like a good deal else of this writer. He is the equal of Ibn Ezra in respect of veiled utterances and abrupt quotations, the connexion of which with the main thread of the discourse, is by no means always easy to fathom. In this instance, it seems to run counter to all we know of Nahmanides' theology to credit him with literally intending to teach that man has no Divine Spirit within him, or that man is *eshet*, "corporeal" or material, and not *neshamah*, "godly" or Divine. The most probable explanation of the difficulty is, that these latter terms are only meant in a comparative sense. Man's spiritual gifts on the day of Creation were, according to Nahmanides, of the same high order as those of the angels. By the present decree they were lowered. Man being corporeal cannot avoid the taint which the flesh necessarily involves. It is this warfare eternally waged between flesh and spirit which reduces the latter to a lower pedestal. But yet the Spirit of God is in man. To assert the contrary would be to negative the position which the philosopher systematically takes up in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Or, again, it is quite likely that the sage is taking "Spirit" here in its physical sense of vitality. It is the *neshamah* which, as we see from the quotation, is the spiritual element, not the *mamonah*. As man misuses the *neshamah* by reason of his corporeality, his *mamonah* must, as an act of justice, be curtailed, *i.e.* his term of life must be lessened. This interpretation has one merit which the other lacks, viz. that it falls better into line with the quotation from Psalm lxxviii. Man's vitality abides not, and therefore he is but a *neshamah* (breath), that passes away and never comes again.

In the Book of Isaiah there are a few passages bearing on this head which need examination. For instance xxxiv. 16, "Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read: no one of these shall be missing . . . for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them." What is "spirit" here? The context speaks of Edom's future desolated country which is to be the abode of wild animals and demon shapes. A variegated host of these are mentioned, and they are dramatically pictured as flocking together in their multitudes to settle down on the doomed land, not one of them missing because all were brought together by the Spirit. What is this spirit? According to the Targum, which renders it בְּרָאֹתָהּ, it denotes the Divine will. The Divine will sets in motion the wild animal creation, so that it may come to prey upon Edom. Rashi ingeniously finds a parallel for this expression in Psalm xxxiii. 6, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth"; he would therefore seem to take "Spirit" as largely identical with "word" and refers back to the first chapter of Genesis where the whole array of created beings springs into existence at the word of God, or, as the Rabbins have phrased it: "The world was created by the power of ten Divine utterances."⁽²¹⁾ Spirit would thus, in Rashi's conception, be an equivalent of the Targumic Memra which so largely denotes Divine action in the world. Among modern scholars Marti agrees with the Targumic view stated above. He says, "Unter dem Geist, der die Tiere nach Edom versammelt, ist Jahwes Willen zu verstehen, der sich eben in der Prophetie der Verf.s Ausdruck verschafft hat" (p. 246). Duhm (p. 229) seems to echo Rashi when he says, "Jahwes Geist, sein mal 'ak, sein logos, hat die Tiere versam-

melt." Dillman again (p. 306) takes up more of an omnipresent, immanent view of the Divine Spirit here. He says, "Sein Hauch, d.i. Geist, durch welchem er alles in der Welt wirkt."

Another instance in Isaiah of the same openness to the double translation of *רֹוח* as breath or spirit of men is found in lvii. 16, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I always be wroth : for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made" (A.V.). The syntactical translation of the Hebrew here is by no means easy. A phrase like "the Spirit shall fail before me" is either exceedingly ambiguous or meaningless. Modern scholars are strongly in favour of interpreting Ruah and Neshamah as synonymous, and both having the broad and general meaning of "Lebenskraft" or "Lebensgeist," i.e. vitality, the life principle of created beings generally. An eternally angry God, says the prophet, would be a contradiction to the world ; for then all life would fail before Him. We should have chaos. This view of the animate and inanimate world as existing not by their own deserts, but as a result of the ever tolerant mercy and compassion of God is not strange to the O.T. Psalm ciii. has several such teachings. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us after our iniquities" (verse 10). Again, "Like as a father pitith his children, so the Lord pitith them that fear Him. For He knoweth our frame ; He remembereth that we are dust" (verses 13, 14). And many others. God pities the weakness of His creation and His anger becomes love. But the Talmudic and Targumic interpretations both give the Ruah here a spiritual turn and each in a different way. The latter says, "Verily I shall in the future restore the spirits of the dead." This is an instance of the not frequently recurring allusions to immortality in the Targum ; the

word נָאכַת being taken in the sense of "to cover, clothe," as in Psalm lxv. 13, lxxiii. 6. The soul will again be clothed in the vestments of the body. The Talmud in Yebamoth 62a, Aboda Zara 5a, Niddah 13a, by an ingenious but strained interpretation deduces the novel idea of the pre-existence of the soul.

Before making any final deductions as to the varying trends of theological thought which are reflected in these several O.T. usages of Divine Spirit, two exceptional instances in the O.T. where the phrase "Holy Spirit" occurs must be examined. These are, Isaiah lxiii. 10, 11, and Psalm li. 11. The tendency among modern critics is to regard them as personifications. Marti strongly holds this view. He classes the phrase with that of Acts vii. 51, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost"; and Ephesians iv. 30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." But it is hard to see how any conclusive argument can be drawn from these two N.T. quotations. They are obviously mere repetitions of the phrase in Isaiah. The idea of "resisting" (*ἀντιπίπτειν*) the Holy Ghost is present in the Hebrew מְרוּחַ which clearly has that meaning here as well as in Numbers .xxvii. 14, נַאֲשֵׂר מְרוּחַם פִּי—the resisting of the Divine word at the waters of Meriba in Kadesh. The idea of "grieving" is present in the Hebrew וְצַבּוּ, the noun of which, viz. צַבּוּ which = grief, sorrow, is of frequent occurrence. Both verbs govern a direct accusative as can be seen from Numbers xxvii. 14, and from Psalm cxi. 33, "Because they were rebellious against His spirit"; or Isaiah iii. 8, "To provoke [lit. to rebel against] the eyes of His glory." It is difficult to see why Christian interpreters should just fix upon the two usages of רֹוחַ we are considering, as personifications. One might just as well argue that the word "my mouth," in Numbers

which all the records of Holy Writ unequivocably attribute to Moses.

To come now to Psalm li. 11. The disposition to regard the Holy Spirit as a personification is not so strong as in Isaiah lxiii. 10, 11. Neither Cheyne nor Budde look at it as a personification. Budde (who takes the view that this is an Exilic Psalm in which the poet voices the sin-laden consciousness of the Jewish community) sees in it an allusion to the ever-constant presence of God in Israel. Just as in the Isaiah passage, so here, says Budde, "Gottes Angesicht und sein heiliger Geist im Parallelismus stehen." By the "presence of God" Budde understands the Divine revelation which, starting at Sinai and finding expression in the prophets, manifested itself in diverse ways in the body of the Jewish nation. It is in this sense that, differing from Marti, he expounds the phrase מֶלֶךְ פָּנָיו in Isaiah lxiii. 9.⁽²²⁾ It is "der Engel, in dem Gottes Angesicht erscheint, in dem er in Person gegenwärtig ist, also ebenfalls eine Offenbarung Gottes." In other words, an angel is a revelation of the Person of God, which was a reality to the heart and mind of Israel in spite of recurrent shortcomings, and which inspired them to a higher range of thought and conduct than characterised the contemporary heathen world. And this, says Budde, is a parallel idea to that of the Holy Spirit alluded to here. Israel has the Holy Spirit because in him God's revelation to the world was made manifest. "Israel is the nation of Revelation because he has God's Holy Spirit." Thus Budde strikes quite a new and original note. The Holy Spirit for whose retention the author of Psalm li. so devoutly prays is the ever-presence, the immanence of the Divine in Israel, a fact which was manifested to the world in all the variegated stages of his

history. It is a forerunner of the "Shechinah" of Rabbinism.

As a matter of fact, a reference to the Rabbinic comments on the verse shows a close analogy with Budde's theory, excepting that the Rabbins uncritically regarded the Psalm as in its entirety a prayer of David. The Rabbinic view is given in T. B. Yoma 23a. According to Rab (Abba Arika) David suffered leprosy for six months, as an expiation of various sins he had wilfully committed, as, e.g. the taking of Uriah's wife, the numbering of the people (2 Samuel xxiv.), etc. As a consequence of his unclean condition "the Sanhedrin separated themselves from him and the Shechinah withdrew itself from David."⁽²⁹⁾ For the return of the Sanhedrin David prayed in the words of Psalm cxix. 79, "Let those that fear Thee turn unto me, and those that have known Thy testimonies." For the return of the Shechinah, David prayed in the words of our Psalm li. 12, "Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation: and uphold me with Thy free spirit." The analogy between Budde's view and the Rabbinical view is, that the whole drift of the Psalm is a petition for the vouchsafing to men of those manifested traces of the Divine love, which are given expression to in the word Shechinah.

My conclusion is: that the two instances of the Biblical phrase "Holy Spirit" besides containing all the constituent ideas of the prevalent Biblical phrase "Spirit of God," express also that deeper sense of the abiding nearness of God to Israel, that mystical perception that the Deity in His various aspects or emanations "rests upon," or "hedges round," or "fills" certain persons, or communities, or countries, a fact to which the Rabbins gave the names of "Shechinah," or "Ruah Ha-Kodesh."

For the sake of conciseness, and to give greater point to the arguments which follow, I summarise the main heads of the constituent ideas which enter into the term "Spirit of God" in the O.T. They are:—

Firstly.—The principle by which all things are preserved. As the breath of God it is the basis of all created life. It is co-extensive with nature.

Secondly.—It is the source of man's emotional and volitional life. As such it is the basis of morality.

Thirdly.—It is an endowment to the king, inciting him to rule in righteousness and equity.

Fourthly.—It is an endowment to various characters connected with the cult and government of Israel, inspiring them to various worthy deeds and thoughts in the interests of their fellows.

Fifthly.—It is an endowment to the nation of Israel giving them the ever present possibility of religious betterment and regeneration.

Sixthly.—It is a promised gift to the Israelites in the future when wisdom and might and the fear of God will be a greater reality. This is the Messianic aspect.

Seventhly.—It is the well-spring of prophecy.

Eighthly.—It is the soul, the immortal portion of man which being part of the Divine life returns after death to the God that gave it.

In the sense of Holy Spirit as it occurs in the two passages in the O.T. that we have alluded to, it denotes further:—

Firstly.—The universality of God's Spirit.

Secondly.—The self-revelation of God to man. The Immanence of God in man. His abiding presence. His nearness.

The main difference then, Biblically considered, between "Spirit" and "Holy Spirit" is that the latter is a deepening of the former. It teaches that

Immanence of Divinity which is the subject of the 139th Psalm. It has not yet reached the stage of being personified, as is the case with the Rabbinic ideas of Shechinah and Holy Spirit and with the N.T. teaching of the Holy Spirit. If there is anything in the O.T which may be rightly characterised as an instance of personification it is the "Wisdom" of the eighth chapter of the Book of Proverbs.

In this eighth chapter, Wisdom is a Divine property, an attribute of God. Just as it is man's guiding principle in the preservation of his rightful attitude towards himself and those about him, so with God it is His plan wherewith He created the world and sustains it ever since; it is His master workman⁽²⁴⁾ (viii. 30); the first of His works (viii. 22). It presided over the birth of nature, and its voice calls to men bidding them choose the good and shun the evil. Wisdom is a cosmic power, the all-encompassing intelligent will of God manifesting itself in the creation and preservation of the world, and as an eternal and unerring guide and ruler of mankind.⁽²⁵⁾

Now what distinguishes this conception of Wisdom is the fact, that here Wisdom is, as it were, temporarily detached from its Divine source and treated as Personality—a Personality which is related to the whole universe, controlling the life of the human race. This thought undoubtedly makes a great advance upon anything previously written in Jewish circles. Its effect upon the Apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon and upon much of the speculative philosophy of Philo is without question. But what is of importance to point out is, that its detachment from its Divine source was not meant by the writer to imply "any theory of permanent distinctions within the Divine nature each endowed with its own separate self-

consciousness.”⁽²⁶⁾ Wisdom has no personal life of its own and points to no profound mystery in the Being of God. Right through the passage viii. 22-36 it is “God’s” wisdom. The allusions to the Divine ownership of wisdom are frequent. “The Lord possessed me”; “When He established the heavens, I was there”; “Rejoicing in His habitable earth”: all these passages clearly imply that wisdom is a *quality* belonging to God, one of His attributes by which He makes Himself known and felt in the world of men and in the human heart, one of the elements in the Divine nature which is most in sympathy with the innate tendency in man to go on striving ever upward and onward. Wisdom is, after all, only God’s wisdom, no matter how near an approach to personality there may be in the various descriptions of the term; and in the same way “Spirit” is “God’s Spirit” and “Holy Spirit” is “God’s Holy Spirit”; and similarly right through the Rabbinical literature, however near an approach to a distinct personality there may be in the Rabbinical handling of these expressions, there is always the underlying assumption that the personification is only used for the purpose of a particular doctrine, and not for the teaching of any metaphysical divisions in the Godhead.

To conclude this introductory chapter — which is intended as a sketch of the O.T. treatment of “Spirit,” preliminary to and preparing the way for the Rabbinical treatment of the “Spirit,” let me briefly recapitulate three main points:—⁽²⁷⁾

(1) Spirit in the O.T. is an emanation of God finding a place in the world and in man. In the world it is the basic upholder and preserver of all. The natural world is an embodiment and a revealer of God’s spirit. It is perpetually renewed by God’s spirit. In

man it is a gift or endowment coming straight from God, prompting man to goodness and righteousness, and showing itself in its highest form in the prophetic faculty.

(2) Holy Spirit in the O.T. teaches with more distinctness and emphasis, the truth of the manifestation of God in Israel (in the Isaiah passage) and in an individual (*i.e.* the Psalmist in li. 11).

(3) Wisdom in Proverbs viii. reaches to the limits of personification. A quality through which God acts and through which He is known, is objectified. It dwells and finds its special delight among men. This brings us to the very doors of the Immanence doctrine. The Rabbinical doctrine of the "Holy Spirit" is compounded of these teachings, with the admixture of many new elements which these old sages drew either from their own independent exegesis of the Scriptures, or from their own personal observations and experiences of the Spiritual life, or again, as a result of their intermingling with extraneous nations and the consequent additions to, and transformations of, their original views.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIV

(1) Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (Macmillan, 1909), on page 1, says: "The Hebrew 'Ruah' like the Greek 'Pneuma' and the Latin 'spiritus' originally had a physiological and not a psychological value, denoting the human breath." From this, Swete goes on to show how it came to acquire the higher meanings.

(2) Maimonides in the *Moreh Nebuchim*, i. chap. xl translates, "And the air of God moved."

(3) Cp. Psalm xxxiv. 18, "And saveth such as be of a contrite spirit."

(4) The phrase *מִן מִן* suggests "the purposelessness and ineffectiveness of all man's enterprises" (G. Currie Martin on Ecclesiastes in *Century Bible*).

(5) Wellhausen says that they had become merely public demagogues.

(6) It is worthy of note that Rashi on this passage in Numbers

adopts rather a physical interpretation. He is "the Lord of the Spirit of all flesh," because He knows the different dispositions, temperaments of men.

(7) Psalm xxxi. 5, cp. Zechariah xii. 1.

(7a) For the idea of this classification, I am indebted to a little work entitled *Spirit in the New Testament*, by E. W. Winstanley (Cambridge University Press, 1908).

(8) Rashi takes as **לכוא בקרבו** **לפעמים**, i.e. an incidental, intermittent visitation of the Divine Spirit.

(9) Rashi here has בָּרָהּ תַּרְאֵ, thus differing from the Targum. Probably Rashi was thinking of the warlike exploits mentioned in the next chapter, whereas the Targum confined itself to its view of him as a prophet.

(10) Nahmanides on this passage, in the midst of other interesting remarks, quotes the Rabbinical statement about Bezalel, בְּזַלְאֵל יְהִי שָׁם ; on this Nahmanides adds as follows : " The Tabernacle hints at these [i.e. the Tabernacle has its archetype, as it were, in the letters by which heaven and earth were created]. Bezalel understood the secret of it all." Thus, Nahmanides would make Bezalel a mystic.

(11) Both Rashi and Ibn Ezra here explain **מְבָרֵךְ** by the familiar figure of a candle at which several other candles are kindled without any diminution in its light.

(12) Some such ideas as these, seem to underlie the remark attributed to Jesus in John iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

(13) See Rashi's remark on Ezekiel i. 1, "And I saw visions of God." It was, says he, כען חלום ולא כMESS and מה שפְּקָדָלִיא שָׁאַיָּה קָרֵית.

(14) Modern critics assign these Balaam prophecies to a comparatively late date. Israel must by then, say they, have acquired a permanent ascendancy over the other Canaanitish nations. See, for an interesting study of the subject, Cheyne in *Expository Times* (1899), x. 399-402.

(15) Cp. the phrase in Nehemiah ix. 20, וְרָאֵךְ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ.

(16) From Prof Whitehouse's *Isaiah* in Century Bible Series.

(17) Marti on this passage in Isaiah says: "Mishpat ist die Zusammenfassung aller Mishpatim, die Israel besitzt, also die sittlich religiöse Ordnung, die wahre Religion Jahves." He shows how similarly the Arabic "مِسْهَد" means both judgment and religion.

(18) Cp. the Rabbinic comment on the windows of Solomon's Temple as being רַחֲמָה שְׁמֶרֶת, i.e. wide from the outside but narrow from the inside, so that the Divine light focussed inside might be disseminated broad-cast when it reached the outside of the Temple.

(19) Rashi, following the Midrash on this passage, points out how in Genesis ii. 7, where the creation of man is alluded to, the word "w" is spelt with double "Yod," whereas in ii. 19, where it speaks of the animal creation, the same word is spelt with only one "Yod"; the reason for this being that man possesses, as it were, two creations, one in the past and the other in the future, at the time of the resurrection.

The beast will not enjoy the latter. Rashi would thus read a spiritual interpretation into these early passages of Genesis.

(20) Genesis Rabba xxvi. 6 gives other interpretations of this passage. It makes it allude to the resurrection of the dead. Thus : "I will not put my spirit in them at the hour when I give the reward of the righteous in the time to come." As the commentators explain, this "reward of the righteous in the time to come," means the resurrection of the dead. It is worthy of note that according to this, and many another Rabbinical statement, it is only the "righteous" who will enjoy the resurrection ; and yet, one might cull ever so many references to a resurrection in which all will participate. This is undoubtedly a dark and difficult point. In all probability it marks different strata in the development of the idea of resurrection among the ancient Jews. The New Testament references are also by no means clear. Luke xiv. 14, xx. 35, speaks only of the resurrection of the just and worthy ; but John v. 29, Acts xxiv. 15, Rev. xx. 5 allude to the "resurrection of the dead" in general. Resurrection of the dead early came to form part of the belief in the Messianic advent. This is seen from the Rabbinic interpretations of Ezekiel xxxvii., Isaiah xxvi. 19, Daniel xii. 2, etc. etc. Exactly when the conjunction in these two ideas was effected, it is hard to say ; but it is not hard to see how the conjunction should become the starting-point of the broader teaching about a general resurrection. At the time when the resurrection teaching was embodied in the Eighteen Benedictions of the Jewish ritual, it must clearly have been the undisputed opinion of the Jews that resurrection will be for all and not for a select few.

(21) Aboth v.

(22) Marti here substitutes (following the LXX.) נִגְשָׁה (i.e. messenger) for the textual נִגְשֵׁה, and reads נִגְשָׁה in the absolute state (not נִגְשַׁה in construct state as in text), and also he adopts the Ketib נֹגֵשׁ = "not" for the Keri נֹגֵשׁ = "unto him." He translates the passage "Nicht ein Bote oder Engel ; Sein Angesicht rettete sie." He adds by way of explanation : "This contrast of messenger and angel on the one hand, and God's face on the other shows that "נִגְשָׁה is no longer, as formerly, the person of God ('die Repräsentation Jahves') but a substitute, and that the 'Face of God' denotes God Himself." A combination like נִגְשָׁה נִגְשָׁה, says Marti, is impossible ; you get "נִגְשָׁה or "נִגְשָׁה, but not "נִגְשָׁה נִגְשָׁה.

(23) According to Rabbinic tradition, the Sanhedrin originated in the Mosaic period, the seventy elders of Numbers xi. 16-30 being the first Sanhedrin. It existed from that time onwards without interruption. But looking at the matter critically it must be argued, from the fact that there is no passage in the pre-exilic books relating to it, that no fixed body, answering in any way to what was understood by a Sanhedrin, could have existed before the time of the second Temple. In Nehemiah viii. 8 we read of an assembly which in the Talmud is designated as the "great synagogue." But this could only have been an occasional body. At a later date, which cannot be determined, this occasional body was replaced by a standing body—the Sanhedrin. For further information on this knotty point see Bacher's article "Sanhedrin" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

(24) Hebrew **רֹאשׁ**. The LXX. has ἀρμόζοντα = arranger or fashioner of things. Rashi takes it as “foster-child” or “ward,” based on Lamentations iv. 5. But this is rather forced, as the word should have read **רֹאשׁ**. But Rashi’s view is favoured by the Targum. The meaning “master-workman” or, as Cheyne says, that of “architect” or “artist,” is supported by the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom vii. 22, much of which seems to have been borrowed from this chapter of Proverbs.

(25) “In one passage, animated by a fine enthusiasm, Wisdom is a cosmic force, the nursling of God, standing by His side at the creation of the world. This conception, foreign to the pre-Ezran O.T. thought, suggests the period when Jews came under Greek influence.” Prof. Toy’s article “Book of Proverbs” in *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

(26) Montefiore, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (London, 1887).

(27) Volz (*Der Geist Gottes*, Tübingen, 1910) on pp. 159-165 gives a good account of the hypostasisation of the Spirit in Philo and the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic writings.

CHAPTER XV

IN WHAT RESPECTS IS THE RABBINIC TREATMENT OF
HOLY SPIRIT AN ADVANCE UPON THE OLD TESTA-
MENT TREATMENT?

THE main lines of advancement in the treatment of the O.T. idea are the following:—

(1) The O.T. terms “Spirit of the Lord,” “Spirit of God,” occasional terms such as “spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord” (Isaiah xi. 2), the two usages of Holy Spirit in Psalm li. 11 (LXX. *πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον*) and Isaiah lxiii. 10, 11, and the personified usage of Wisdom in Proverbs viii., all these become included in that one term of wide embrace—the *שׁוֹרֶן רַוח*, “Holy Spirit.” This latter term covers all the various aspects of spirit which are represented singly by each of the O.T. expressions, and in addition, it figures sometimes as but another name for God, but more often as something distinct from God—sometimes it is employed as a personality, sometimes it is conceived mysteriously as some physical object, sometimes it is but another name for the Divine inspiration which made prophecy possible, and sometimes again it is merely an equivalent term for the Books of the O.T. in the sense that these enshrine for all time, the living words of the Holy Spirit. But let it not be imagined that the Rabbinic doctrine of the Unity of God is one whit impugned by these usages. The Holy Spirit is

God's Holy Spirit. It is not itself God ; it is a property of God, it is an emanation of God, a visible, or rather perceptible, trace of His workings in the world and in the heart of man. It is the Rabbinic portrayal of God in action, it is the emphatic declaration of the *nearness* of God, His direct concern in the affairs of men, the ever possible accessibility of man to His grace.

(2) Primitive both in its nature and in the manner in which the Rabbins expressed it, is the conception of Holy Spirit under the figure of light or fire. The same tendency was noticed in the Shechinah conception. It is a materialist idea, but yet it has its mystical side. Its advance on the O.T. idea consists in its recognition as a separate entity. And not only is it materialised as light and fire. It is also symbolised as wind, creating various startling noises—and this, not only in the atmosphere surrounding certain personages, but inside them, *i.e.* in several of their limbs and internal organs. The mystical elements in all religions present these phenomena. A typical illustration in the history of early Christianity is the passage in Acts ii. 2, “And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.” As Dr. Rufus Jones says, in his *Studies in Mystical Religion* (page 8), when he speaks of mysticism in the primitive fellowship of the early Christians, “The Divine incoming was conceived as an invasion—as a swiftly rushing wind—and the effects looked for were miraculous, sudden, and temporary.” And just as many of these strange experiences among the founders of the Church can be justified and made palatable to modern thought *only* when viewed from the standpoint of mysticism, even so can we only give any real meaning to the seemingly far-fetched pictures of spiritual experience given us by Talmud and Midrash under cover of light,

fire, wind, etc., by the adoption of the mystical theory. But of this more anon.

(3) The usage of Holy Spirit as a personality, presents many points of perplexity. A survey of the subject convinces one, that the phrase is often a mere circumlocution for God. The Rabbins held very stringent notions about the sanctity of the Divine name. They thought that a too-frequent repetition of it was tantamount to an infringement of its sanctity—and this in spite of the fact that the repetition may have been rendered absolutely necessary by the circumstances. Consequently a safe refuge was found in the usage of either "Shechinah" or "Holy Spirit." It is often a tax on one's ingenuity to discover whether an allusion to the Holy Spirit is a mere substitute for the Divine name, or whether it implies the deeper mystical meanings of the Divine Immanence. And then, again, in many a passage the Holy Spirit seems merely another name for Torah; and one can understand this on the ground that according to Rabbinical opinion all the Books of the O.T. are one of the manifestations of the activity of the Holy Spirit. But it is hard to discriminate between the cases where it is merely an equivalent for Torah or where it has a deeper connotation.

And then, again, there is the fact that in passages which recur in Talmud and Midrash, whereas one of the versions may contain the phrase "Holy Spirit," another may report exactly the same thing of the "Shechinah." This raises the difficult question of the exact difference between the two. And the question is further complicated by the hardship of knowing whether many a passage in the N.T. which speaks of the Holy Spirit is an echo of the Rabbinic Shechinah or Holy Spirit. It sometimes seems to be the equivalent of one and some-

times of another. It must be remembered that in Greek δόξα is the only equivalent for Shechinah, and yet it is really not a true equivalent because it merely = “gleam of light.” It may be for this reason that the N.T. often uses πνεῦμα ἄγιον for the Shechinah of the original Hebrew or Aramaic. And this may possibly explain further, why the πνεῦμα ἄγιον is so much more prominent in the N.T. than שׁוֹקֵן הָרִים in Rabbinical literature—of course speaking proportionately in each case.

(4) We saw how in the O.T. the presence of the Divine Spirit in an individual or in Israel was often interpreted, both by the ancient Jews in Targum and Talmud, as well as by several modern Biblical scholars, as the existence of the gift of prophecy in Israel or that individual. This teaching has been expanded much, in Rabbinical literature. Whereas in the O.T. it is the gift only of the recognised prophets of the Canon, or of sundry individuals of outstanding prominence, or of the Hebrew nation at certain points of its career, in Rabbinic as well as in all the Jewish theology succeeding, it is, so to speak, popularised. The Holy Spirit may be acquired by any one provided he orders his life in conformity with the highest and the best. It is not vouchsafed by Heaven miraculously, i.e. without any sufficiently-evident pre-existing cause —[and in the O.T. there is certainly this element of the inexplicable about it]—but its existence in any individual at any one epoch of time is the effect of a clear cause. Thus, to give a few instances. In Yalkut on Psalm xvii. we are told, “He who studies [Torah] with the object of practising it will merit the gift of the Holy Spirit.” In other words, the Holy Spirit is an asset which every man may gain, if only his previous spiritual equipment warrants it. Again, in Yalkut on Genesis xlix. it is said, “Whatever the saints

do, they do by the power of the Holy Spirit." Saintliness means a comprehensive sense of conformity with the letter and spirit of Judaism; all have it in their power to attain to it. Many a Talmudic sage was vouchsafed the Holy Spirit; thus in Leviticus Rabba ix. 9 R. Meir figures in a curious anecdote as צופה ברא"ה, "gazing by means of the Holy Spirit." Several more examples will be quoted later on.

And then, again, the Rabbins expanded the scope of the Holy Spirit so as to include even pagans (under certain conditions). This inclusion is quite unthought of in the O.T., as well as is the question whether the Holy Spirit can be vouchsafed to any one outside the Holy Land. The difficult question of the relation between the possession of the Holy Spirit by a nation or individual and the consequent possession by that nation or individual of the faculty of prophecy suggests itself over and over again to the student of the Rabbinical writings; and it is nowhere satisfactorily answered. Mediæval theologians like Saadiah, Jehuda Ha-Levi, Maimonides, Nahmanides all devote their attentions to the subject. The Midrash imputes the possession of the Holy Spirit to many of the prominent personages in the Book of Genesis, even to women as Sarah, Rebekah, etc. Are we to infer that they are, therefore, to be considered as prophets? It is not always possible to answer this question definitely.

(5) Another striking development in the usage of the Holy Spirit by the Rabbins may be noted under the following heads:—

(a) It is the composer of all the books of the O.T. The inclusion of a book in the Biblical Canon meant necessarily that it must have been inspired or written by the Holy Spirit. (See T. B. Megillah 7a; Tosefta Yadaim ii. 14.)⁽¹⁾

CHAPTER XVI

MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE

IN no part of our inquiry do we get more incontestable proofs of the existence of a strong subjective mystical element in Rabbinism, than in the department into which we now enter. In this respect, Rabbinism is no exception to the rule which characterises the subjective aspects of all faiths. A glance at a book like Tylor's *Primitive Culture* convinces one, of the inevitable substratum of individual mystical experience which played such a large part in the formation of the very earliest revelations. It is quite a tenable theory that when, in O.T. literature, Moses hears the voice speaking out of the burning bush, or when Isaiah sees the Lord sitting on a throne high and exalted, and listens to the sound of the Seraphim in their laudation of the thrice-holy God, or when Ezekiel in a fit of ecstatic rapture at the marvellous sights revealed by the opened heavens, falls upon his face and hears a voice speaking, these men by their direct personal intercourse with a Divine Presence were pioneers in making religion a living power for the men of their own generation. Early Christianity makes much of the sudden inrushing of the Spirit in individuals and families whereby many prophesied; and "speaking with tongues" became a common accomplishment of the first Christians. That

Saul of Tarsus was a mystic—though not exclusively so—is too clear and too uncontested to need proof here. The many autobiographical passages in his writings give the plainest testimony of his proneness to spiritual experiences of an extraordinary sort—although the question whether these were the outcome of a physically normal or abnormal constitution, is a problem upon which there will ever be diversity of opinion.

Rabbinical literature likewise presents us with a considerable budget of both visual and auditory phenomena of an unusual sort, in which various Rabbis played the parts of subject or object. God's Immanence, His accessibility, His nearness, His all-encompassing and all-embracing reality became so deep-seated a conviction to the minds of individual Rabbis here and there, that the barriers separating the intellectual and emotional aspects of mind broke entirely away, and they saw with the eye, and heard with the ear, sights and sounds from an unseen world, traces of a Presence which impinged upon them, invaded them, filling them with high and divine impulses, raising them to the position of the elect whose state of life is a complete unity of being with God. I refer to those older parts of the Talmud which are generally styled בראיתות בראשית and מעשה מרنبיה. The mysteries conveyed by these terms became a source of perplexity to succeeding generations of Jewish scholars. They saw danger in them. A later Baraita forbade the teaching of them to any, except the most cultured (T. B. Haggigah 13a). The reason commonly given for the prohibition is that these sections of the Talmud comprised some secret esoteric doctrine of early times which, probably on account of its containing a strong admixture of foreign elements, would, if spread among the masses, create an undesirable scepticism. But it would be nearer the

truth to say that they denote, as is obvious to any one who reads the originals, the subjective mystical experience of individual Rabbis. They realised in intellect and feeling the presence of God. Being in an ecstatic state of emotion when the imaginative faculties wield uncontrolled sway, their vision became elaborated with all sorts of weird and fantastic additions. When returning to their normal conditions, they described these phenomena to their friends and disciples as actual occurrences. And they became enshrined among the traditions of the people. But the Rabbis of a later generation examined them. These legalistically-trained sages were not slow in detecting the weak spot, viz. that these occurrences were but the subjective phenomena of individuals, and therefore had no general external validity. Why, then, should the people spend their time and energy in expounding them, and diving into the secrets hidden beneath their mysterious language? Was it not more important that other matters of Halacha and Haggada should hold the people's attention—matters of external practise, points of ritual and moral teaching, doctrines emphasising man's obligations to God from the stand-points of external necessity and external authority? But subjective experiences always form the most entrancing of reading. Yes, herein lies the danger. Would-be devotees must be weaned from them, or they may be mistaking the shadow for the substance. Hence the Rabbinic interdiction.

My object in the preceding remarks has been to show that the materialistic conceptions of Holy Spirit of which I am about to treat (and those of Shechinah treated of in the first part of this book) are either a branch, or an outcome, of the subjective mysticism of many an individual Rabbi whose first-hand experiences

are indicated in the titles מ"ר ונביה בראשה מ"ר and מ"ר ונביה בראשה מ"ר. These mystical experiences of a few, became a matter of knowledge among the many. If individual men, it was argued, had had visions of God, these visions must have had some material embodiment, and as the phrase "Holy Spirit" was taken to mean the universal indwelling of God in the world, His constant self-revelation to man and man's ever-present capacity to see visions of God, it follows that when the sages spoke of this aspect of the Deity's activity by the employment of the term "Holy Spirit" their language was largely couched in terms of the material.

Instances of this material conception of Holy Spirit take various forms :—

(A) AS LIGHT OR FIRE

There are three different words used largely in this connexion.

They are (1) סנה, (2) צפה, (3) חצין.

Examples of (1) are T. B. Megillah 14a, יסנה זו שרה. Examples of (2) are T. B. Megillah 14a, רלה נקרא שמה יסנה שסנתה ברוח הקודש, "Iskah (in Genesis xi. 29) is Sarah; why was Sarah called Iskah? Because she looked (סנה) by the Holy Spirit." Instances of (2) are : Leviticus Rabba ix. 9, "R. Meir looked (צפה) by the Holy Spirit" (in the quaint anecdote of the extreme measures which Meir once took in order to make peace between husband and wife). Instances of (3) are : Leviticus Rabba xxxii. 4, "The Holy Spirit enlightened (חצין) Moses" (in allusion to Leviticus xxiv. 10-12—the Midrash making Moses play a more elaborate part than is assigned to him in the Scriptural text). Other references where another form of this same verb, viz. וננזה, is used are Genesis Rabba lxxxv. 9 ננזה בה ר"ה, "the Holy Spirit illumined her" (viz.

Tamar). Genesis Rabba xci. 7 has the same phrase alluding to the brethren of Joseph when they exclaimed “We are all one man’s sons” (Genesis xlvi. 11).

These illustrations are enough to make it clear that the “Holy Spirit” was somehow associated with some kind of visual sensation. The possessor of the Holy Spirit actually saw some kind of light.

To strengthen the argument the following passages may be further quoted:—

T. B. Makkoth 23a (cp. Genesis Rabba lxxxv. 12; Eccles. Rabba xiv. 16; Midrash Tehillim, Psalm xvii., Psalm lxxii.) we read: “**בשלשה מקומות הופיעה ר’ח ונרו**,” “The Holy Spirit shone forth in three places: in the court of Shem; in the court of Samuel; in the court of Solomon.” Here, obviously, the Holy Spirit is materialised as a luminous body. That the passage is capable of being interpreted in the higher intellectual sense of enlightenment, or in any religious or ethical sense implying Divine guidance, etc., vouchsafed to those who sat in these courts, does not at all disturb the tenability of our theory.

Leviticus Rabba i. 1, ר’ח שורה עלין פנחים בשעה שהיוה, “At the time when the Holy Spirit rested upon Phinehas the latter’s face was burning like flames.” Here the material is not so much light as fire. We saw much of this in our “Shechinah” investigation. Clearly both departments of our subject have this in common, viz. that the mystical phenomenon of the Divine Presence was materialised as light or fire.⁽¹⁾ A reference to Leviticus Rabba i. 1 will show the close association between this “fire” idea⁽²⁾ and the idea of an angel; one order of angels was the “Seraphim,” whose essence was fire. This again proves that the average opinion of Christian theologians about the Jewish view of angels, viz. that

the angels are mere intermediate links arbitrarily introduced to bridge the gulf between a distant transcendent God and the world, is partially false. The angel is often a synonym for Shechinah or Holy Spirit, and denotes the energising activity of a God immanent in the universe.⁽³⁾

מִרְום שָׁנֶגֶב יוֹסֵף נִסְתַּלְקָה מִמְּנוּ "ג' וְג' ר' Genesis Rabba xci. 6, "From the day that Joseph was stolen the Holy Spirit left him (Jacob); as a consequence, his sense of sight became imperfect and his sense of hearing also." This is a remarkable statement. The Holy Spirit is here materialised as the inner light in man's eye—the luminant which throws the image upon the retina; and it is the medium of man's hearing; the instrument which brings the auditory sensations to the drum of the ear.⁽⁴⁾

(B) AS SOUND

The well-known passage in Acts ii. 2, which speaks of the sudden heavenly sound of a "mighty rushing wind," is a mystical experience to which there are parallels in the regions of our present investigation.⁽⁵⁾ And, by the way, the next succeeding verse about the appearance of "cloven tongues like as of fire" brings out the close association of the two material ideas of fire and sound in the case of the Holy Spirit in Rabbinical literature. The one source of all these "sound" passages is Ezekiel iii. 12, "The Spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing." But it is quite possible that the ambiguous meaning of *Ruah* in Genesis i. 2, associated as it is with the word *טוֹרָה*, "making a fluttering sound," gave the impetus to much of this kind of speculation. I have already alluded to the remarkable statement

in the T. B. *Sotah* 9b about the "Shechinah making a ringing sound before Samson like a bell." Leviticus Rabba viii. 2 develops the same extraordinary thought in connexion with the Holy Spirit's influence upon Samson. "As soon as the Holy Spirit began to knock (לְגַשֵּׁךְ = שָׁקַשְׁךְ as Commentary מִתְנָהָה כְּהוֹנָה points out) Samson took two mountains and knocked them together just as a man knocks two pebbles together." Further on it is said, "At the time that the Holy Spirit rested upon Samson, his hairs stood up and knocked against one another like a bell, and their sound was heard from Zarah to Eshtao'l."

A curious association of sound and Holy Spirit is alluded to in *Yalkut* on Psalm xxiv. "What is the difference," asks the Midrash in effect, "between the heading לְדוֹד טוֹמֵר לְדוֹד and מִזְבֵּחַ ?" And the answer it gives is that in the former case David first played upon his harp and then the Holy Spirit came unto him; in the latter case the Holy Spirit came first and then David played his harp. This, of course, raises the important question as to the relation, from the Biblical standpoint, between music, prophecy, and spirit.*

From the general mystical standpoint, the ideas of Shechinah and Holy Spirit are identical. There are variations in detail, but the terms are used too indiscriminately to permit of any general statement as to the exact shades of difference implied. (See, however, Appendix I.)

There is a passage in the *Commentary* of that delightful mystic of the Middle Ages—Nahmanides—which touches my present subject so vitally, that I cannot forbear from making a reference to it. It is in his commentary on Genesis iii. 8, "And they heard

* Cp. T. B. *Pesahim* 117a where the same is said of the Shechinah. Cp. also *Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah* 55a.

the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden at the cool of the day." He is in agreement with Ibn Ezra, and at variance with Rashi in holding that the verb מתחלך ("walking") refers to the voice and not to God. It was the voice that was walking in the garden of Eden. And he puts this idea in the same category as the phrase וחתהלך בוחנכם, "And I will walk among you." In other words, the Voice is the perceptible symbol of an indwelling God. The phrase לרוח הים also strikes Nahmanides as echoing the same mystical strain. Whenever the Divine Presence makes itself known there accompanies it the sound of a great and strong wind, as it is said, "And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks, before the Lord" (1 Kings xix. 11). Also, "Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind" (Job xxxviii. 1). The presence of God made itself known to our first parents by wind-noises. "But although these noises were not as strong as those heard and felt נשאר הנבוארה במחזה in a vision, as in the case of other prophecies, so that Adam and Eve should not be terrified, nevertheless the latter hid themselves מפני מעוזמזהם through their crafty and cunning devices."

What Nahmanides here expounds from the objective standpoint, has been the subjective experience of the mystics among the Rabbins, as well as among the adherents of primitive Christianity.

(C) AS OTHER MATERIAL OBJECTS

In T. B. Haggigah 15a it is said: "Ben Zoma said unto him [i.e. to R. Joshua b. Hananya, who was standing on an ascent of the Temple, and was angry at Ben Zoma's failure to rise before him], 'I was gazing at the space between the upper and lower waters, and I see there is only an interval of about three fingers' breadth

between them, as it is said, And the Spirit of God was hovering upon the face of the waters, *i.e.* as a dove which hovers over her young, but does not touch them.''" In Targum on Canticles ii. 12, the phrase "voice of the turtle-dove" is paraphrased as "the voice of the Holy Spirit concerning redemption." Cp. Mark i. 10, "And the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon Him"; also Matthew iii. 16, Luke iii. 22. In Pesikta Rabbati, p. i (edit. Friedmann), Genesis Rabba lxx. 9, the Holy Spirit can be "drawn up" like water which is drawn from a well. Cp. Matthew iii. 11, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and fire," where the two Rabbinic ideas of water and fire are combined. On the latter point it should be added that in a passage on page 55a of Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah—quoted also in Ruth Rabba iv. 12—the phrase בָּתְהַדֵּבָר is said to be applied to the second Temple, because it was from the latter that the people "used to draw up, like water, the Holy Spirit." The association with Ruth is a most happy one. Boaz says to her (ii. 8, 9), "Go not to glean in another field . . . but abide here fast by my maidens . . . Have I not charged the young men that they shall not touch thee? and when thou art athirst, go unto the vessels, and drink of that which the young men have drawn." What is that which the "young men have drawn"? It is the Holy Spirit, which, like the Shechinah, was focussed in the Temple. Thither young and old came to quaff the invigorating draughts of the Spirit's teaching and influence. The Rabbins discerned in this advice of Boaz to Ruth, his desire that Ruth should enter the fold of the Israelitish faith.

The third materialisation of the Ruah is denoted by a passage in Leviticus Rabba xvi. 2. We meet there with a curious commentary on Job xxviii. 25, "to make the weight for the winds" (A.V.). The

literal meaning of the verse, taken in consonance with the context that precedes and follows, is probably that "God weighed out the due quantity of air for the world." Light though air is, yet its weight is seen to be very real when we experience it in the form of wind.⁽⁶⁾ But in the above-mentioned Midrash, R. Aḥa says אַפִּילוּ רְדָה שְׁטוֹחָה עַל הַנּוּבָרִים אֵינוֹ שָׂרוֹחָה אֶלָּא בְּמַשְׁקָלָה, "Even the Holy Spirit which rests upon the prophets only rests by weight." In illustration we are further told that "some prophesy to the extent of one book and some to that of two." The allusion is probably to what is said in T. B. Baba Bathra (15a) about certain Biblical personages having composed more books than one by means of the Holy Spirit. What has to be observed, however, is the strongly material sense in which Holy Spirit is conceived. It has weight like an article of food or clothing.

This concludes the instances of materialistic representation of Holy Spirit which I have been enabled to cull in the course of my investigations into some of the more prominent realms of Rabbinical literature. Viewed from an objective standpoint, the material representation of the Holy Spirit would seem to belong to an inferior stratum of thought regarding the mystical relation of God and man. From the subjective aspect, however, they can be recognised as part and parcel of the experience of the immanent Presence of God which mystics in all ages have felt.

We now pass on to consider what objectively is a more exalted conception of the meaning and work of the Holy Spirit in Rabbinical literature.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

(1) For this association of Holy Spirit with fire, cp. Acts ii. 3, 4,
"And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it

sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak. . . ." This is certainly a reflexion of the Rabbinic idea. When the fire sits upon them (*i.e.* סְמִיחָה נָאֵת in the Rabbinic phraseology) they have the Holy Spirit and then begin to speak—just as in the Rabbinic sense, when a man has the Holy Spirit he becomes, in a sense, a prophet—prophecy being used in an extended sense. Swete on p. 72 (*Holy Spirit in the New Testament*) speaks of the O.T. having no "precedent" for this idea of tongues of fire in Acts ii. 3. This is so; but Rabbinic literature has much that is akin to it.

(2) In Tanhuma on פֶּרַת we get a phrase like שָׁרֵךְ רֹאֵת קָרְבָּן, "the Holy Spirit waxed cold." Such a word as קָרְבָּן could only be applied to something which is hot, fiery.

(3) Cp. Numbers Rabba x. 5 as follows: "During the interval when the prophets were executing the Divine errand, the Holy Spirit resting upon them used to inspire dread in those that looked upon them; every one stood in awe of them because they resembled angels."

(4) See Tosafoth on T. B. Baba Bathra 121a where he quotes from the Tanhuma on זְרַעַן as follows: "The Shechinah did not rest upon him, הַיְלֵדָה נָאֵת אֲלֵיכָהּ בְּפָנָיו, all the time that he was in mourning for Joseph." Another instance of identity of idea in Holy Spirit and Shechinah.

(5) Baron Von Hügel in his great work, *The Mystical Element of Religion* (vol. ii. pp. 90-94), gives several instances from Neo-Platonic mystical philosophy, of the usage of fire and light as symbols of God's immanent action. Thus he quotes from Dionysius: "Let us then elevate our very selves by our prayers to the higher ascent of the Divine rays; as though a luminous chain were suspended from the celestial heights and reached down hither, and we, by ever stretching out to it up and up . . . were thus carried upwards." Von Hügel learnedly points out how this simile of a luminous chain from heaven is to be traced back through Plato (*Theatetus* 153 c, *Republic* x. 61 B, 99 c) to Homer. In the *Iliad*, viii. 17-20, Zeus tells the gods in Olympus that in order to see all things that go on in the earth, they [the gods] "hang a golden chain from heaven and seize hold of it." One notices in all this, some strong traces of resemblance to the Biblical ideas of angels ascending and descending from earth to heaven, etc.—and also of the general missions of angels in the universe. Rabbinic mysticism might thus be said to find itself very largely anticipated in its pronouncements upon the nature and function of angels, and we have already pointed out the proximity between the angel and the Shechinah or Holy Spirit. Von Hügel again, on pp. 69, 70 (vol. ii.) points out how Philo "had held Him [God] to be in some way ethereal and luminous." And the same teaching clusters round St. Paul. "St. Paul, under the profound impression of the Historic Christ and the great experience on the road to Damascus, perceives the risen heavenly Jesus as possessed of a luminous ethereal body, a body of glory" (Acts xxii. 11). Von Hügel, following the N.T. theologians, identifies this risen Christ with the "Spirit" alluded to in 2 Corinthians iii. 17 and in three other places. "In all four cases," says he, "we get Christ or the Spirit conceived as an element, as it were an

ocean of ethereal light, in which souls are plunged and which penetrates them." The Rabbinic notions of Holy Spirit as light, echo this beautiful mystical thought.

(6) From Professor Peake's "Job" in the *Century Bible*. Professor Budde says on the same verse: "Auch dem Winde hat Gott bei der Schöpfung sein Maximalgewicht d.h. seine äusserste bewegende Kraft gegeben." Cp. St. John iii. 34, "For God giveth not the Spirit by measure."

CHAPTER XVII

PERSONIFICATION OF HOLY SPIRIT

THE Rabbinical aversion to a too-frequent usage of the Divine Name is a truth too well known to need much dwelling upon, at this stage of our inquiry. We have seen how the objection really rests upon a twofold basis. This consists of (*a*) the ever-constant possibility of the infringement of that mysterious sanctity which hedges round the name of God; (*b*) the risk of giving countenance to the doctrine of the existence of two Divine Powers." Too much latitude in the pronouncement of God's name whether in speech or literature might lead, thought the Rabbins, either to careless, disrespectful, irreligious handling of it, or to a scepticism as regards the doctrine of the Unity. What the Rabbins taught to others, they were foremost in carrying out themselves. Hence a term like "Shechinah" or "Holy Spirit" or "Kabod" (glory) is often inserted in the course of a sentence where the word "God" might have stood just as well. No further positive teaching is conveyed by the usage of these particular modes of speech; the object is the purely negative one of keeping out what might seem a too easy-going and glib usage of the Divine name. But on the other hand, in many other passages, though these various designations of God may serve the purpose just alluded to, they also have another and greater object as well, viz. to express

the nearness of the Deity to man, His concern in the well-being or pain of man, His presence in the world and man at certain crises in their experiences; in other words, His Immanence—in so far as the primitive thought of the ancient Rabbins may be said to have had glimmerings of that theological idea.

Here a point must be mentioned which arrests the attention of the student and often puzzles him. According to the Rabbins all the Books of the O.T. were composed by the Holy Spirit. This means that the latter influenced their authors; so that in uttering or writing their remarks, they were to an extent the passive tool of the Holy Spirit. The O.T. Holy Writ is thus one of the great visible results of the activity of the Holy Spirit. So much is this the case that the two are often identified, *i.e.* Holy Spirit is another name for Holy Writ and *vice versa*; and where we get the phrase “Holy Spirit says,” the meaning is equivalent to “Holy Writ says.” But, what is so very arresting, is the extraordinary ways in which the Holy Spirit is personified in all such passages. Not only does it quote single verses or words of Scripture. It also cries. It holds a dialogue with God, or some person. It pleads. It laments and weeps; it rejoices and comforts.⁽¹⁾ But it always effects these things by introducing quotations from Scripture. The explanation is this: Holy Scripture is the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit is God. Hence all this pleading, crying, exhorting, blaming, punishing, comforting, etc., on the part of the Holy Spirit is a graphic attempt on the part of the Rabbins to show the abiding presence of God by the side of man.^(1a) The Deity is not merely transcendent; He is not isolated by immeasurable distance, by impenetrable walls, from the joys and woes of the world. He mingles in it. When man does right, He is

next to him to cheer him on in his upward course. When man sins, He is so near that the sin touches Him; and He reprimands man not only by chastisements, but by making clear to him the folly of his ways, by pleading with him for the choice of the better path and the forsaking of the evil way. And as with individuals so with communities. God is present in Israel. His voice is audible. He is a pleader, an advocate, and nothing escapes His ken.

Thus, Rabbinic personification of Holy Spirit is but another means whereby to express the conception of an Immanent God.

These general statements must now be illustrated in detail:—

(A) THE HOLY SPIRIT AS “CRYING”

Tanhuma on Genesis פ v. reads: ר' זוחה צוחות חולדות כזוחה לא צוחה צוחה לא זוחה אלא וככאשר עבוי מזוה אמר ותהי ה לא צוחה פרעה צוחה ה אורה נזורה ונכ יפרוץ.

“The Holy Spirit cries, Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not? (¶) Pharaoh commanded [the wholesale destruction of Jewish male children] but God commanded it not; on the contrary, the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew.”

The Holy Spirit is here depicted as vitally concerned in the preservation of the Jewish male babes from destruction. “Pharaoh commanded.” But a greater power, an unseen Divine force was at work the whole time, making Israel immune from Pharaoh’s wiles. It was the immanent Holy Spirit in Israel. Tanhuma on Exodus ז vii. reads: “The Holy Spirit cries, and says, Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead, more than the living which are yet alive.” (¶)

This is the oft-repeated Midrashic passage about the inability of Solomon to convey the Ark into the Holy of Holies. The difficulty was overcome only after Solomon had prayed to God, asking Him to "remember the mercies of David Thy servant" (2 Chronicles vi. 42). The paternal merit of David turned the scales in Solomon's favour. And the Holy Spirit attests the greater virtue of the dead David than the living Solomon. This passage shows that the Holy Spirit is conceived as an ever-present Divine principle. Even though David had passed away, it existed, so to speak, in the Davidic environment. It came to the help of David's son in the hour of the latter's perplexity.⁽⁴⁾

Tanhuma on Exodus טהראתיהם "ב" reads: "And the Holy Spirit cries, So may all thine enemies perish, O Lord" (Judges v. 31). Aquila becomes a proselyte to Judaism. Hadrian is enraged at his taking what he considers so retrograde a step. Hadrian's minister counsels the king forthwith to put him to death. But Hadrian, strangely enough, thereupon admits that his conversion to Judaism was a right act; it was pre-ordained for Aquila before his birth. In despair and shame the minister, seeing his counsel set at nought, jumps down from the roof of his house and is killed. And the Holy Spirit exclaims, "So may all thine enemies perish, O Lord."

I hold that the Holy Spirit is here regarded as the immanent Divine principle in Israel, safeguarding Israel's honour and the life of those who attach themselves to Israel; seeing in the death of Israel's traducers the realisation of the Divine sense of justice.

Tanhuma on Leviticus ורואו "ב" reads: "The Holy Spirit cries, Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? . . . they that tarry long at the wine (Proverbs xxiii. 29, 30)." The Holy Spirit here protesting against

intemperance is clearly the innate Divine principle immanent in man which urges him to shun the wrong and choose the right. Tanhuma on Leviticus פ' מזורה reads: "The Holy Spirit cries, and says unto him, Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin."

Plagues come upon man, say the sages, as the Divine retributive punishment for any slander that he utters against his fellow-man. The Holy Spirit is the immanent voice of God in man warning him against this sin.

Tanhuma on ii. מזורה conveys a similar sentiment to the preceding, based on Proverbs xxi. 23, "Whoso keepeth his mouth and his tongue, keepeth his soul from trouble."⁽⁵⁾

Lamentations Rabba i. 45 reads: "The Holy Spirit cries, and says, For these do I weep (Lamentations i. 16)."

Vespasian, emperor of Rome, sends three ship-loads of Jews and Jewesses to inhabit a certain immoral quarter of the city of Rome. They shun the ordeal and throw themselves into the sea. The Holy Spirit weeps over their sad fate. The idea here is rather that of the nearness of God than of His immanence—although, as I have repeatedly indicated, nearness is one of the essentials of the immanent idea. God is so near His distressed people that their sorrows are His. It is a form of the doctrine to which we have alluded before, viz. that God is נִמְלָא בֵּיתֶךָ שְׁמוֹ וַיַּחֲשֹׁב. "He merges His name [i.e. His essence, Himself] in Israel." The closeness of the fellowship is so great that what causes pain to Israel causes pain to God.

Lamentations Rabba i. 45 repeats the same ideas on the basis of another tyrannous act perpetrated by a Roman Emperor.

Exodus Rabba xv. 15 reads: "The Holy Spirit cries, and says, But the eyes of the wicked shall fail, and they shall not escape . . ."

The immanent God of justice brings things to such a pass that all hope of escape should be cut off from the Egyptians in their hot pursuit after the Israelites at the Red Sea.

Numbers Rabba xv. 21 reads : "R. Isaac said, The Holy Spirit cries, I hate the congregation of evil-doers."

We have here an expression of the inevitable clashing between an immanent God and sin. When Moses delays his descent from the Mount, the people express extreme dissatisfaction (*Exodus xxxii.*). The elders remonstrate with them for their ingratitude to the intrepid leader who had wrought so much for them. They slay the elders. Then Hur remonstrates, and they slay him. Finally, they come to Aaron with the request, "Make us gods that shall go before us." Should Aaron demur they threaten him with the same fate.

The spirit of murder combined with the spirit of idolatry had taken possession of the Israelites. What a cleavage between such vice and the Holy Spirit of God which inhabits and informs the tent of Israel !

כְּשִׁירָאֵל נַנְסֶן לְבָתִי
כְּנִסְיוֹת וּקְוִין ק' שָׁמַע בְּלוֹן הַדָּעַת בְּקוֹל אֶחָד בְּדָעַה וּמָעַם אֶחָד
דָּק בָּה' אָמַר לְהָם דְּיוֹשְׁבָתָה בְּנָנִים . . . אֶבֶן נְשִׁירָאֵל קְוִין ק' שָׁמַע
בְּחוֹף הַדָּעַת . . . וְהַזְקָדֵשׁ צְוָהָת וְאוֹמְרָת בְּרָהָז דְּזָדֵי וְדָמָה
לְלַבְבָּנָה שֶׁל טָעֵלה הַדּוֹתִים לְנַחֲךְ בְּקוֹל א' בְּנַעַמָּה א'
. . . "When the Israelites enter the synagogues and read the Shema with devotion, with one voice, one mind, and one tone, God says unto them, 'O ye that dwell in the gardens, when ye read [your prayer], then the companions, i.e. I and my host of angels, listen to thy voice : O cause me to hear it' (*Song of Songs viii. 13*). But when the Israelites read the Shema with inattention and in a disorderly way without any unison and with no devotion, then the Holy Spirit cries, and

says, ‘Make haste, my beloved, and be like the roe’ (Song viii. 14), *i.e.* make haste away to the heavenly host [there is a play upon words here, צבוי = “roe” and צבאות = “host” and דמיה = “to be like,” and also “to sing” or “praise”]⁽⁶⁾ who say Thy glory in unison, with one voice and one melody. . . .”

There is more than one difficulty here. The phrase “O ye that dwell in the gardens” is obviously a reference to what is said in the same Midrash, vi. 2, on the words “to feed in the gardens,” אלך בתי נסיות ובירתי מדשיות, “this means the synagogues and study-houses.” The garden-dwellers are the synagogue-dwellers.

The following deductions seem to me fairly justified : (a) The parallelism of “God” and “Holy Spirit” in the two sections of the passage show the identity of the two in the minds of the authors. (b) God, in His immanent aspect as Holy Spirit, is intensely near the Israelite when in prayer. He hears him and speaks to him. There can be no closer communion between the human and the Divine. (c) The stress laid upon “unison” in prayer reminds one so much of the mystical teaching of the Presence of God in the midst of companies of men who come together for the high purpose of studying the Torah—a conception frequently alluded to in the Rabbinic writings, and which is akin to the statement by Jesus (Matthew xviii. 20), “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (d) The Holy Spirit—who is God—counsels God to flee away from disunion, *i.e.* it counsels itself to have done with Israel, when Israel’s ranks are weakened by disruption or discord. This is but a graphic way of describing that mystical fellowship with God which was always thought to be a proud possession of Israel, and which never left him,

whithersoever he wandered as exile—but which certainly does leave him no sooner the collective tie is broken. The higher union of God with Israel can only exist, when the lower union of Israelite with Israelite is thoroughly complete.

Song of Songs Rabba viii. 12 reads : “ And the Holy Spirit cries, Make haste, O my beloved, i.e. make haste away from the nations of the world, and ally thyself with the Israelites.”

This passage belongs to the same category of teaching as the preceding. But there is an important difference. Besides the Holy Spirit speaking and addressing God, there is also the personified Torah. When Israelites feast they bless and praise God, and God is pleased. When heathens eat and drink, they demoralise themselves and blaspheme God. God thereupon is angry, and threatens to destroy the world. Then the Torah enters, and by its plea averts the threatened calamity. Lastly comes the Holy Spirit counselling God, i.e. itself, to leave the unworthy nations and make its exclusive abode in Israel. All this may be regarded as a piece of that particularism which is so pronounced a feature of much of Rabbinical literature. It may, however, with equal propriety, be looked upon as an indication of the problem which every theory of Divine Immanence has to wrestle with and solve for itself, viz. the reconciliation of an immanent God with the great fact of sin. God’s Holy Spirit cleaves to Israel only because Israelites at their meals and pastimes are sinless. At the feasts of the nations, sin abounds ; sin and Holy Spirit are antagonistic ; hence the Holy Spirit flies away.

Continuous duologues in which the Holy Spirit is a prominent actor are found occasionally. I have already quoted a striking instance from the Sifri on *rwm* “^b

הברכה, p. 148 (Friedmann's edition), where a chorus, in which the chief singers are the Holy Spirit and Israel, proclaim the praises of the Deity.

Another instance which is typical is the following from Esther Rabba x. 4. When Mordecai has turned the tables upon Haman by making the latter accompany him through the streets upon horseback as the man whom the king delighted to honour, he triumphantly chants verses 1-3 of Psalm xxx., "I will extol thee, O Lord; for Thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me. . . . Thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit." Mordecai's disciples thereupon join in with verses 4-5. Haman next quotes verses 6-7, "And in my prosperity I said, I shall never be moved. . . . Thou didst hide Thy face, and I was troubled." Esther enters the chorus with verses 8-9. The *כָּנַת יִשְׂרָאֵל* [collective body of Jews] respond with the prayer in verses 10-11. And the Holy Spirit finally comes upon the scene, exclaiming in the final verse of the Psalm, "In order that glory may sing praise unto Thee, and not be silent: O Lord my God, I will give thanks unto Thee for ever."¹⁷ This delineation of the rôle played by the Holy Spirit, seems to me but a picturesque way of describing the great theological truth that God's Presence is with the righteous man who is undeservedly wronged; that He vindicates justice, giving the evil-doer the fruit of his evil; the Deity who encircles and fills men, helps the worthy man while waging a feud to the death with the man of sin and violence.

(B) THE HOLY SPIRIT SPEAKING, EXHORTING, ETC.

The following instances show much the same trend of treatment of Holy Spirit as the preceding, except that instead of "crying" there is some milder expression,

such as speaking or exhorting, etc. Numbers Rabba xvii. 2, says: "רַהֲנָה וְאִמְרָה לֹא וּמַיְלָא", "The Holy Spirit came forth and said unto him, Go, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart ; for God now accepteth thy works" (Eccles. ix. 7).⁽⁸⁾

The allusion is to 1 Kings viii., the dedication of Solomon's Temple. In verse 65 it is said that Solomon made a feast for all Israel, "seven days and seven days, even fourteen days." On the eighth day (*i.e.* the day after the end of the second seven days) he dismissed them in great joy. This eighth day, say the Rabbins, was the eighth day of Tabernacles.⁽⁹⁾ If so, what about the observance of the Fast of Atonement? It must have fallen within these fourteen days of revelry! Could the Israelites have desecrated the great Fast Day by eating and drinking? Yes! they did. The building of the Temple was an event of such exceptionally great religious and national significance that even the Day of Atonement could be set aside for its sake. But the Israelites nevertheless felt pangs of distress. It was hard to reconcile themselves to the belief that they had committed no sin in so acting. But the Holy Spirit comes forth to reassure them.

Holy Spirit is that inner voice of the Divine element in man which rebukes him when he has done wrong, but comforts and encourages him when right is on his side. The Israelite returning home after his fourteen days of merriment at Solomon's shrine, feels smitten with the sin of having desecrated the Atonement Day. But a higher voice within overrides the remorse. The voice of the Immanent God tells him that the offence is but a venial one under the circumstances. Let him be merry, not downcast, for God accepts his work.

Tanhuma on פָּנָא "ב", Numbers xxiii. 1, says:

"The Holy Spirit said, 'Better is a dry morsel, and quietness therewith, than a house full of sacrifices with strife' (Prov. xvii. 1), i.e. better is it before God to offer Him the 'meat-offering mingled with oil, and dry' (Lev. vii. 10) than a house full of sacrifices, accompanied with the strife which you wish to introduce between me and the Israelites."⁽¹⁰⁾

The Midrash depicts Balaam's desire for seven altars as being based upon the fact that seven altars were erected to God by the seven saints, viz. Adam, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses. This was a mark of their fidelity, and God accepted them. Why should not the seventy nations erect altars to be similarly accepted before God? The Holy Spirit objects to this on the grounds that envy and strife would ensue between God and Israel, were God to be served by as many as seventy altars of the heathens. God prefers the humble meat-offering of Israel to the holocaust of the nations.

This is a strong example of the "particularist" doctrines of Rabbinism. God is immanent in the whole world, in the seventy nations as well as in Israel; but His bond with Israel is, somehow, very mysteriously closer than His bond with the other nations. Any interruption of the fellowship between Israel and God is tantamount to making strife between God and Israel, and must be averted at all costs. Similarly in the succeeding passages of Tanhuma (which comment on Numbers xxiii. 4, "And God met Balaam") the Holy Spirit addresses Balaam and quotes Proverbs xv. 17, "Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith," which is interpreted to mean that the humble Passover meal of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, eaten by the Israelites, is preferable, before God, to the oxen and bullocks offered as sacrifices.

by the seventy nations, the latter causing, as it were, a bar between the fellowship of Israel and God. The Holy Spirit's union with the seventy nations is inconsistent with its union with Israel. Similar instances of this particularist tendency were noticed in the section on the Shechinah.

Yalkut on Jeremiah i. 5 (quoted from the Pesikta Rabbati, edit. Friedmann, p. 129a, b) says : "The Holy Spirit said unto him [Jeremiah], Do I not love a lad that has not as yet tasted sin ? I redeemed Israel from Egypt, and called him a lad, as it is said, When Israel was a lad then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt (Hos. xi. 1)." Jeremiah struggles against the Divine call to go out and prophesy. He instances the cruel treatment which men like Moses, Aaron, Elijah, Elisha, suffered in the execution of their prophetic missions. Besides, he pleads youth as a bar. But all this is but the prompting of his lower self. Against this there rises the higher self, the voice of the Divine within ; the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* the immanent God, who finds lodgment in his soul and ousts the unworthy impulse, addresses Jeremiah with an exhortation to choose the right course. Yalkut on Hosea xi. 3 [based on Mechilta, לילא, chap. iv., see Friedmann's edit. p. 30], has a striking comment, in this connexion, on the words "I have taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms." It remarks : *הנִזְלָתִים וְהַנִּזְלָתִים לְבָדֵךְ אֶת אֶפְרַיִם*, "I have taught my Holy Spirit to bless Ephraim." In what ways was Ephraim (*i.e.* Israel in general) blessed by the Holy Spirit ? The Mechilta passage expounds fully. It instances the simile of the child journeying in the company of his father, and attacked by various wild beasts coming from all sides. The father adopts all sorts of means for sheltering his beloved : he places the child before, then behind, then above, then upon his shoulder, then

spreads his mantle over him—no device being untried when the child's safety is at stake. Such was exactly the method of the Holy Spirit's dealing with Israel. More is involved here than the mystical fellowship of Israel with God. Fellowship implies accompaniment, but not necessarily anything more. Here, however, the Holy Spirit is protective as well. It is not only a piece of that Divinity which allies itself with Israel and fills the Israelitish camp in all the places whithersoever it may wander; it is also the supreme guardian, preserving the nation from harm. The substance of these Midrashic ideas is, of course, not new. They are implied in Deuteronomy i. 31, xxxii. 11, Numbers xi. 12, Isaiah lxiii. 9. What however is new, and peculiar to the Rabbinical exposition, is the ascription of all these actions to the work of the Holy Spirit. This was a natural development of O.T. ideas. The Scribe and the Pharisee, the "Tanna" and the "Amora"—these were direct heirs to the precious doctrines of O.T. literature. And, in keeping the torch aflame, it was but natural that they should throw light upon hitherto dark places: that the application of their intellects to the problems put before them, working in combination with a rich spirituality of experience, should result in growth, expansion, and development.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVII

(1) The Yalkut on Koheleth ch. vii. 27, commenting on the peculiar usage of the feminine verb in the phrase *n̄np m̄w*, remarks: "At times it [the Holy Spirit] speaks in the masculine, and at times in the feminine." Clearly, it is here but a personified substitute for Holy Writ.

(1a) Cf. Volz, p. 168. "'Statt der lebendigen Offenbarungsträger' hat der Geist Gottes nun ein ständiges Organ, das heilige Buch; in diesem Buch hat er einmal in vergangenen Zeiten gesprochen, aber er spricht heute noch durch dasselbe: deswegen kann man von

einem Bibelwort sagen ‘der heilige Geist spricht’ In allen diesen Aussagen ist die Ruh ganz personhalf gedacht.”

(2) Lamentations iii. 37.

(3) Ecclesiastes iv. 2. Another instance is in Koheleth Rabba x. 17.

(4) This Rabbinic legend of Solomon’s inability to convey the ark into the Holy of Holies occurs in various forms throughout the Talmud and Midrashim. See T. B. Sabbath 30a, Moed Katan 9a, Sanhedrin 107a, Exodus Rabba viii. 1, Koheleth Rabba iv. 2, Yalkut on Psalm vii. and xxiv., Pesikta Rabbati, edit. Friedmann, p. 6.

(5) See also Tanhuma on Genesis in verse “And it came to pass when Isaac was old.”

(6) Based on the phrase *נִלְפָה רַוחַ נֶתֶן* (Psalm lxv. 2). It is a strained rendering. See commentary *מִנְגָּדָל מִנְגָּדָל* on the passage.

(7) Another form of this Midrash slightly altered in some details is given in Leviticus Rabba xxviii. 6.

(8) This pronouncement is found in varying forms in T. B. Sabbath 30a, Moed Katan 9a, etc. It is worthy of note that in the latter two cases it is not the “Ruah” spirit that speaks, but the “Bath Kol”; and the latter says: “Happy are ye in that ye are all destined for the life of the world to come.” What the “Bath Kol” exactly was, and what its relation can be, to the Holy Spirit is a matter for special research.

With this hortatory usage of personified Holy Spirit, cp. Hebrews i. 15, 16, “Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that He had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them, etc. etc.”; also Acts xxviii. 25, 26, “And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say. . . .”

(9) That it was the eighth day of Tabernacles is seen from 2 Chronicles vii. 8, 9. It is also said there that the first seven days were devoted to the dedication of the altar, and the second seven to the feast. This explains the odd usage of *וְשֵׁבֶת שְׁבַע*; here “it” = the eighth day of the Festival of Tabernacles. The LXX here omits the words “and seven days, even fourteen days,” thus making the festival of dedication begin and end exactly with the Feast of Tabernacles; and accordingly the phrase, “on the eighth day he sent the people away,” fits in all right.

(10) This Midrash is also found in Numbers Rabba xx. 18.

CHAPTER XVIII

HOLY SPIRIT AND PROPHECY FROM THE RABBINIC STANDPOINT (1)

THIS subject falls naturally within the scope of my inquiry. It would, indeed, be passing strange, were it not so. In the O.T. literature prophecy is the crowning manifestation of the Spirit of God in man.⁽¹⁾ The prophet is a man whose life and thoughts are determined by personal fellowship with God, and intelligent insight into His purpose. It has already been shown how the idea of a fellowship with God is a prominent constituent of the mysticism associated with the Rabbinic conceptions of Shechinah and Holy Spirit. We have now to see in what ways, and from what standpoints, the Rabbins worked upon these closely-associated Biblical doctrines of Prophecy and Divine Spirit, what new vistas of teaching they opened up as the result not only of their theoretical musings and debates upon this branch of Holy Writ, but also of their attempts to realise these dictates of Holy Writ in their practical everyday life.

Something must first be said as to the bearings of O.T. prophecy upon the subject of mysticism and immanence.

In Exodus vii. 1 Aaron is called a "prophet" because he is to be the spokesman or "mouth" of Moses. This raises two points for discussion. (1) Seeing that

apparently the basic function of the prophet was that of public speaking, was he also considered as necessarily a predictor? (2) What must be the etymology of the word נביא? We take the latter first. Gesenius, following Ibn Ezra (see latter's strictures upon Rashi's derivation of the word in Exodus vii. 1), surmises that the root is probably נבא, which may be another form of נבע, and means "to gush," "effervesce."⁽²⁾ A kindred word is the Hiphil form נפוץ, also applied to prophecy. Thus in Ezekiel xxi. 2 we get אלazon נפוץ in the middle of a verse, the whole of which is an injunction to prophecy. In Amos vii. 16 the phrase נפוץ ולו is clearly a parallel to the phrase in the front portion of the verse נבאו לו. In Micah ii. 6 the phrase אל חתפיו יטפונ as נלא חתבאות נבואה. As far as the mere outward act of utterance goes, the two words would seem to express exactly the same idea. But there is a further idea in the root נבָא, which is absent from the נפוץ root. When words are said to gush out, to effervesce, from the mouth of the speaker, there is the implication of a certain attendant emotion. A new feature is brought upon the scene. There is not only the outer word to be accounted for; the state of mind accompanying and producing it has to be taken into cognisance. That this latter feature plays a conspicuous part in prophecy is proved beyond a doubt by even a cursory reference to the experiences of the O.T. prophets. Take the case of Saul and his meeting with what is in one place (1 Sam. x. 10) described as a בול of prophets, and in another as a מניין of prophets (*idem* xix. 20). The physical and mental condition of these men showed itself outwardly as a case of religious frenzy. What arrests attention is not the substance of their message, not the words they poured forth—as a matter of fact

these are not even given in the Scriptural narratives—but the abnormally intense excitement, the unchecked transport of ecstasy under which they laboured at the moment of prophesying. This naturally gave them a licence to the perpetration of acts which would have been undreamt of by them in their normal state. They, for the nonce, put aside all the restraints of the moral life and social custom. In 1 Sam. xix. 24 we read how Saul in one of these ecstatic moods actually stripped himself of his garments and lay naked a whole day and night.

Saul's prophesying is an instance of the lower or more primitive grade of prophecy—that the O.T. depicts a progressive series of strata of prophetic capacity is known to every student of its pages. But even if we take a typical instance of the higher class of prophecy, we observe the same phenomenon. Isaiah falls into this class; and his experiences as depicted in chap. vi. unmistakably point to the existence of an ecstatic element of prophecy.^(2a) This chapter is Isaiah's consecration-vision. It is a theophany, a remarkable and vivid manifestation of God's Presence, by means of which he is summoned to the great work of his prophetic ministry. How intensely strong must his psycho-physical faculties have been at that critical moment when "the foundations of the thresholds were moved at the voice of Him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke"! From the succeeding verses it is apparent that the prophet was in a state of utter prostration. And yet was this abnormal? Was Isaiah the prey of some mischievous delusive frenzy? Unquestionably not! Frenzy there was, but it was not delusive, it was not abnormal. God was merely fulfilling Himself to him through these channels, just as the "word of the Lord" had come, or was to come, to Hosea,

Amos, Micah, Jeremiah, and other prophets. Under the spell of the Divine hand, the prophet lies with all his powers of mind and body dormant to everything except that which the Divine master wishes him to see and to feel and to experience. So close is the intercourse that the soul of the prophet actually merges itself in God : "He attains moments of exaltation in which God comes specially near to him, and the Divine will becomes specially clear."⁽³⁾ He hears tones from a super-sensuous world ; he sees shapes whose existence is real only during the critical moment when the hand of God is upon him. It is on an assumption like this that we can best account for the highly-figurative and picturesque language which characterises so many of the prophetic visions. The particular errand on which the prophet is to go ; the particular national defect that he is to declaim against and remedy, these are, as it were, epitomised in a picture which is flashed upon the prophet during the brief moments of his passive ecstasy. And he understands the meaning of the mystery, instantaneously. He takes his cue unfalteringly. He grasps the situation, and thus the path is at once opened to the realisation of his God-appointed mission. "The foundations of the threshold were moved at the voice of Him that cried." What is this but a flash-picture of the doctrine of the Divine Immanence voiced in the preceding sentence, "the whole earth is full of His glory"? The "house" which the prophet sees is nothing other than the universe in miniature. God's voice shakes the pillars of the house because it is embedded in the recesses of the house ; it is immanent in it in the same sense that God's glory, His Shechinah, is immanent in the great universe, and speaks out of every corner and crevice in it. This great and far-reaching truth is flashed upon

the screen of the prophet's vision by an instantaneous process, and he is to go out to the world to preach and proclaim it to the nations that walk in darkness. For, after all, what constitutes the basic element of the prophet's teaching if not this all-comprehending doctrine of the Divine universality, that the world and mankind are folded in the embrace of the everlasting arms? "And the house was filled with smoke." The phrase is but a metaphorical portraiture of Divine wrath directed against the prevailing human iniquity. Smoke is a common Biblical metaphor for Divine anger. Thus in Deuteronomy xxix. 20 we read, "The anger of the Lord and His jealousy shall smoke against that man." In Psalm xviii. 8, "There went up a smoke out of his nostrils." Cp. also Psalm lxxiv. 1, Psalm lxxx. 4. In the ecstatic moment, the prophet is the plastic instrument in the Divine hand to do the latter's bidding. The momentous fact of the Divine displeasure and all that it entails, is instantaneously thrust upon the prophet's soul; and the prophet awakes from his Divine communion equipped, in a measure that he could not by any other means have been, for the work to which God has called him.

One word more by way of qualification. Prophecy is associated with a passive ecstatic state. We must not make the mistake, however, of thinking that the essence of prophecy consists absolutely in this helpless, overpowered state of ecstasy. The personality of the prophet is a great determining factor. Were this not so, there would be very little to distinguish him from the *μάντις* of classical Greek, who gave out enigmatical frenzied utterances, usually unintelligible; who was the ecstatic announcer of oracles whose secret meaning could only be unlocked to the multitude by the *προφήτης*, the sober-minded interpreter. It is true

that God gives the inspiration. It is true that, under the overmastering spell, it is the Divine will which has to be done, not the prophet's. But the prophet has to prepare himself for a consummation like this, by a previous long-sustained series of acts of self-discipline. His soul must be as "tried silver, purified sevenfold," before he can be worthy of this highest and noblest stage of Divine communion. God's secret is only with the elect, not the unworthy. Before the prophet can have the consciousness that God speaks with him in order to give him new communications and commands, he must know that God has been drawing near to him in closer and closer communion. How can he know this unless he has of set purpose ordered his life upon the severest rules of purity and integrity? This active element in prophecy is exemplified with frequency in the pages of the O.T.* In the Rabbinic literature it plays a dominating part.^(*) There is a close association between prophecy and the Holy Spirit (also in some cases there is a close association between Shechinah and prophecy). The Holy Spirit so frequently comes only after a certain degree of ethical excellence has been attained. It does not come at random, erratically, unaccountably, a mysterious visitant totally inexplicable. It is the crowning stage in a series of uninterrupted strivings after the highest and the best.

As an aid to the understanding of the Rabbinic treatment of the subject, it would be well to devote some attention to the ideas which some of the great mediæval Jewish writers have given expression to, in this connexion. I select two typical men whose works have had the greatest influence in shaping

* I say "with frequency" advisedly. I know there are exceptions to the statement.

the course of both mediæval and modern Jewish theological thought. They are Moses Maimonides and Jehuda Ha-Levi. There is a special appropriateness in the selection of these two, on the following grounds :—(a) A strong vein of mysticism colours their differing philosophies. To make this statement about Jehuda Ha-Levi will arouse no challenge. The domains of poetry and mysticism are the nearest of neighbours. But Maimonides, is he not a consistent rationalist? Yes, he is; but he is a mystic as well. It appears to be one of the great distinguishing features of his philosophic system, that he is able to blend the rational and mystical views of Scriptural and Rabbinical exposition with a logical consistency. That the territories of rationalism and mysticism are not so widely separated from, and not so irreconcilably opposed to, one another as is commonly supposed, is well illustrated by the instance of Maimonides. His rooted objection to anthropomorphism is a sample of the one; the prominence which he gives in his philosophy to the doctrine of **emanation**, “emanation,” proves the other. After all, it is only a mystic who can speak of emanations.⁽⁴⁾ (b) Both Jehuda Ha-Levi and Maimonides take the Rabbinic literature as the *terminus ad quem*, as it were, of their arguments. Their final object is to fix Rabbinic Judaism upon a substantial and satisfying basis, by showing how it agrees upon all points with the facts of (1) the human mind, (2) the general course of Jewish history. All their arguments seem to converge round the one focus of Rabbinism. And we accordingly find a rich harvest of references to all parts of Rabbinical literature such as we do not find in the works of the other mediæval philosophers like Ibn Gebirol and Hisdai Crescas. Their interpretations throw a flood of light upon

multitudinous points. No student can afford to ignore them.

Let us now turn to Maimonides first (although this is opposed to chronological order).

His views on prophecy and kindred themes are found in his *Guide of the Perplexed*, Book ii. chaps. xxxii.-xlviii.

I proceed to summarise them :—

Firstly, Maimonides seemed to favour the view that there is a strong element of passive ecstasy in prophecy. “In the moment when the prophecy is received, the functions of the bodily organs are suspended.”⁽⁵⁾ The prophet is wholly the passive instrument in the Divine hand : “The senses also are nullified in their action. The Divine emanation enters into the speaking faculty of the prophet. This in its turn influences the imaginative faculty, so that it becomes perfect and is then able to do its work.” Maimonides, of course, holds strongly that imagination is an essential element in prophecy. A little further on he adds : “And at times prophecy commences by a kind of prophetic vision ; after that there is an increase of that trembling and great excitement which are consequent upon the perfection of the imaginative faculties ; then real prophecy ensues.” What is to be noticed here is the allusion to the “trembling” and “excitement”—the psycho-physical aspects.

Maimonides’ view of the vital part played by the imagination has the closest connexion with his view —severely criticised by Abarbanel and others—that the prophet’s inspiration never, except in the sole case of Moses, came to him in the waking state, but always in a dream.⁽⁶⁾ The **שְׁמַנֵּי שָׁמֶן** Active Divine intellect “emanates” to man’s intelligence and imagination. This act of communion on the part of the human

with the divine is prostrating. Prophecy is the momentary outcome of ecstasy.

But, secondly, granted that prophecy has these strongly-marked physical characteristics which in the long-run seem to indicate it as being the result of a more or less natural process, has it no moral aspect whatsoever? Does the personality of the prophet count for nought? Can any man become a prophet? Maimonides dilates at great length on these weighty themes (see *Guide of the Perplexed*, Book ii. xxxii.-xlvi.)., and they bear very strongly upon the present investigation into the Holy Spirit.

He states three different opinions, only to reject the first two and adopt the third. I here quote the main points of the three:—(1) God chooses whomsoever He wishes, and vouchsafes the gift of prophecy to him. Whether he be wise, foolish, young or old does not matter. He must not be wholly bad; he must possess some good qualities *צַדְקָה טוֹב וִתְקֻנָּה מְדוֹת* esp. This is enough. (2) Prophecy is the highest perfection of a natural faculty which is innate in man. This highest perfection can only be reached, as he says, *אחר לְמַזֵּד אֲנוֹ*, after a thorough-going devotion to study. Although the faculty is innate in the race, it is only brought to perfection on very rare occasions by an individual here and there. Hence prophets are exceedingly rare, the work of bringing the intellectual faculties to the necessary high-pitch of perfection being extremely exacting. But once the task is achieved the man becomes *nolens volens* a prophet. The man who eats nourishing food must inevitably make rich blood; so the man who raises his intellectual equipment to its natural zenith, must inevitably become a prophet. Maimonides of course assumes that a corresponding moral perfection accompanies the intellectual. (3) Prophecy depends

on the attainments mentioned in (2) with the addition of a special vouchsafing of the Divine Will, i.e. Divine inspiration. A man may be intellectually and morally perfect, but yet may be unable to prophecy. His circumstances, his environment, his particular mode of life at the time, may be of such a character as to thwart the Divine Will from giving the necessary revelation or inspiration. Maimonides quotes as an illustration the case of Baruch the son of Neriah (Jeremiah xlv.), who received his full preliminary prophet's equipment from Jeremiah, and yet the word of God comes to him and says, "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, unto thee, O Baruch. . . . And seekest thou great things for thyself? seek them not. . . ." (xlv. 2-5). These "great things" that Baruch sought were the prophetic gift; but this he was doomed never to have. Prophecy only arises at the call of a Divine fiat; and the fiat is arbitrary.

But it was said just now that circumstances, environment, etc., may thwart the oncoming of the prophetic inspiration. What are these? Maimonides here is in agreement with the Rabbins who said אין הנבואה שורה אלא על חכם עשיר ונ哿ן, "Prophecy only rests upon the man who is wise, rich, and mighty," i.e. not only intellectual and moral equipment is required, but also physical. In fine, into the acquirement of the prophetic faculty there enter the following factors:—(1) Physical strength, so as to endure the strain involved in the moments of ecstatic communion. (2) A training of the intellectual faculties to the highest pitch of perfection. (3) Great imaginative power. This is closely allied with emotion; the vision, etc., that the prophet beholds is the outcome of emotional imagination. (4) Exceptional moral discipline. (5) The absence of all physical, intellectual, or moral disturbances. There must be no pain, no sorrow,

no feeling of degradation. (6) The will of God, into which an element of the miraculous or unaccountable always enters. Maimonides, by this latter provision, takes prophecy outside the realm of mere physical occurrence. In the last resort, there is no accounting, on natural grounds, why of two men with exactly the same outfit as defined above, one should become a prophet and the other should not. Now, what bearing has all this, what light does it throw upon, our investigations into the Rabbinic conception of the connexion between Holy Spirit and Prophecy ? The answer can best be made by again adopting the method of summary classification :—

(a) Prophecy is an emanation from the Active Intellect to the intellect and imagination of man. This assumes the doctrine of the Immanence of God. There can be no emanation from a transcendent God. The Rabbinic doctrine of Holy Spirit is also a very strong phase of "emanation" teaching. God has set His Holy Spirit in man. Man, *i.e.*, possesses in himself an "emanation" from God. Man's communion with God is wholly brought about by the existence of this one cord of communication with his Divine Maker. And were God not immanent, any idea such as Holy Spirit would be unthinkable. There is a quaint passage in Aboth De R. Nathan xxxiv. as follows: "The Holy Spirit is called by ten names, as follows: מליצה, של, בברואה, חזון, דבר, אמרה, תפארת, צוות, ממשא, חזיה." It is at once noticed that nearly every one of these synonyms for Holy Spirit has the closest association with prophecy. The Targum on Isaiah xi. 2, "And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him," has, "the spirit of prophecy."

(b) Prophecy only comes as the culminating point of a life of uninterrupted intellectual and moral discipline.

It is something to be striven after. Man does not attain it without the expenditure of pain and energy. Its acquirement is the hall-mark of a perfection such as only the worthiest few can hope to reach. The state of mind and body which renders the possibility of man feeling himself to be in communion with God, in fellowship with God, or of seeing visions of God, only comes into being after long-continued exercise in the modes of life which elevate man to the highest and most refined pitch of humanity. The Rabbinic association of Prophecy and Holy Spirit likewise emphasises all these points. And so does the allied Shechinah doctrine. A good illustration is given by the remark in Leviticus Rabba xxxv. 7 : הַלְומֵד עַל מִנְחָה לְפָנֶיהָ וּכְהַקְבִּיל ר"ה, “He who studies with the ultimate object of putting his studies into practical effect will have the merit of receiving the Holy Spirit.” This saying implies, that the Holy Spirit is something to be won, not something which man *qua* man carries about with him. It is the reward of a long and toilsome search.

The necessity of this uninterruptedness in the striving after perfection is so stringent, that even physical causes over which man has no control, the ailments to which man is heir, act as disturbing and preventive agencies. Maimonides, as has been seen, makes much of these in his discussion of the true conditions of prophecy. But he is not original here; he merely draws upon the Rabbinic statements made about the Holy Spirit and Shechinah. Thus he quotes, “Prophecy only rests upon him who is wise, mighty, and rich.” He does not give the exact Rabbinic source of this quotation. But in T. B. Sabbath 92a (and paralleled in T. B. Nedarim 58a) we are told, “The Shechinah rests only upon him who is wise, rich, mighty and of good stature.” These two passages, besides proving the close association between prophecy

and Holy Spirit, show the prominent part played by the bodily organism in Rabbinic mysticism. During the years that the patriarch Jacob bewails the loss of his son Joseph, he is bereft of the Holy Spirit (see Genesis Rabba exi. 6), but when, amidst the joyous consciousness that Joseph is yet alive, he "sees the waggons which Joseph had sent to bear him" (Gen. xlvi. 27), then the Holy Spirit again returns to him (see Rashi *ad loc.*) or, as the Targum paraphrases it, "There rests upon him the spirit of prophecy." Only when the physical organism is functioning in its healthy and normal fashion, does the Holy Spirit find its congenial soil in the soul of the man.

(c) From Maimonides' view, as well as from that of the Rabbins, it would appear that prophecy is not confined to the small class of men who are traditionally recognised as official prophets, but that it is a Divine endowment to which a far wider circle of men can attain if only they order their lives to meet the necessary exalted standard of requirements. Only let a man, says Maimonides in effect, discipline his intellectual and moral faculties to the extent demanded; he will then be in the condition to receive the Divine message, if only God wills that he should. (The latter proviso must never be left out of the reckoning.) One main reason why so few men ever attain to the rank of prophet is, that so few can successfully go through the ordeal required for the vocation.

Maimonides is here again reflecting Rabbinic doctrine upon this head. The latter gives the endowment of the Divine Spirit to the patriarchs and their wives; hence they are said by them to "foresee" things, i.e. to prophesy. Biblical celebrities like Joshua, Hannah, the sons of Korah, Samson, David, Solomon, and others all have the Holy Spirit and all have the

prophetic gift. They attributed it even to Rabbinical celebrities either of their own or an earlier generation. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud Shebiit 38d ascribes the faculty to R. Simeon b. Yohai. T. B. Yoma 39b attributes the power to R. Yohanan ben Zakkai. I shall dilate fully upon these points in a separate chapter.

Jehuda Ha-Levi's views are embodied in the "Kusari." According to this mystic-philosopher, there is the closest possible affinity between Shechinah and Prophecy. The Shechinah was to Jehuda Ha-Levi as it was to the Talmudic Rabbins the comprehensive term for the Immanence of God in the Holy Land. Jehuda Ha-Levi follows up this doctrine by confining the possibility of prophecy only to Palestine; and when the objection is raised in the course of the dialogue, that it is possible to instance several men who when prophesying were not resident in the Holy Land, he replies "whoever prophesied only did so either in it (in the Holy Land) or concerning it" (Book ii. vii.-xiv.). He would deny the appellation of prophet to all outside this category. Truly enough Ezekiel prophesied "by the river Chebar," but then Ezekiel had, previously to the Exile, lived in Palestine, the land of prophecy. So had Daniel. Jonah in fleeing "from before God" was really fleeing from the land of prophecy in which he had been nurtured (*ibid.* xiv.). It is noteworthy that Jehuda Ha-Levi follows the Rabbins in attributing the gift of prophecy to a far wider circle than that of the traditionally recognised O.T. prophets. He, too, styled the patriarchs of Genesis, prophets. Thus he speaks of Abraham as prophesying in Ur of the Chaldees, by reason of the fact that he had received the Divine message to go to the land of prophecy (Canaan). All this is due to the mystical presence of the Shechinah. It was the Shechinah that endowed the Jewish people with a kind

of new inner sense. All the best men among them, the סגולָה as he repeatedly styles them, could acquire this inner sense provided they led the life which would render them fit and worthy. It is just on this head that the mysticism of Jehuda Ha-Levi is most pronounced and of the highest interest to the student. By means of a system of vigorous self-discipline it was always possible for the worthiest spirits among the Israelites to have that degree of communion with God עדר שחיו ורואים אותו אֶת וען וצלם וחתונכה במצוות מה נקרא כבוד ושכינה ומילנאות אֶת וען וצלם וחתונכה ומראה דקשת, “which enabled them to see God by the medium of what is termed ‘Glory’ or ‘Shechinah’ or ‘Kingdom,’ ‘Fire,’ ‘Cloud,’ ‘Image,’ ‘Likeness,’ ‘appearance of the bow’” (Book iv. iii.). As the commentators on this passage point out, there is an indication here that Jehuda Ha-Levi’s opinion was that mystical communion with God really meant seeing Him with the naked eye through the medium of the aforementioned instruments. “Kingdom” is an allusion to 2 Chronicles ii. 1, “To build a house for the name of the Lord, and a house for His kingdom,” i.e. the kingdom of God’s glory or Shechinah, which was resident in the Temple. The “image” is a reference to Ezekiel i. 26, “And upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above it.” The “appearance of the bow” is another reference to the mysticism of Ezekiel i. 28. Jehuda Ha-Levi would seem to part company here with Maimonides, who regarded mystical visions of God more as inward than outward, i.e. more realisable by the imagination than by the external senses.

The “Kusari” does not employ the term “Holy Spirit,” but in its place it uses the phrase עבִן אלֹהִי, “the Godhead” or “divinity” or “divine emanation,” and it is probable that the Hebrew phrase is the

equivalent for Holy Spirit. The Israelitish race became selected by God to receive the Torah because so high was the collective standard of their intellectuality and morality that this *ענין אלהי* was ever with them. In other words, so invaded were they with divinity, that they were enabled to commune with God exactly as prophets could. In fact they were prophets. (Book i. xciv.) “The *ענין אלהי* rested on their numbers, so that they reached, all of them, to the stage of the Word (*דיבור*), and the *ענין אלהי* passed over to their works. . . .” In the same chapter the philosopher shows how “the Divine substance,” *i.e.* Divinity, was vouchsafed to individuals here and there (*חידים*) from the time of the first man till the Revelation on Sinai, but only to individuals who were *שלמים בבריאותם ובמצוותם ובאריכותם ובחנחותם ובינולתם*, *i.e.* perfect in their health and in their morals, strong enough to live to a good age, strong in wisdom and ability. This opinion is in agreement with the reiterated Rabbinic idea, that in order that a man should have the Holy Spirit, he must first render himself perfect in morals, in intellectuality, and in body. Jehuda Ha-Levi seems, however, to think that with the twelve sons of Jacob there started this outpouring of the “Inyan” upon the whole community of Israel. This was the secret of their continued vitality throughout the rigours of Egyptian slavery. After this time there were again throughout Israel’s history men here and there of superior moral merit who were vouchsafed communion with the Deity. He illustrates the idea by the analogy of a good tree. If a seed or branch is taken from a good tree and transplanted, the fruit produced at first may not in any way resemble that of the original tree; it will probably be much inferior. But after the branches have thickened and multiplied, and the tree has grown to a healthy maturity, then in all probability

the ensuing fruit will fully resemble that of the original in sweetness and worth. Exactly so is it with the Jewish race. Adam was created in the image and likeness of God. This shows that he was endowed with Divinity. He transmitted it to his descendants, several were unworthy, and these it shunned. But the original must inevitably come out. This it did, by showing itself throughout the whole range of Jewish history in the select few who shed lustre upon each succeeding generation. In Book ii. xiv. (near the end) Jehuda Ha-Levi expounds the same argument, showing how the "Inyan" as prophecy filtered down from age to age to the small set who were worthy.

One point is clearly recognisable throughout the theology of the "Kusari," viz. that the Divine element implanted in the great men of early Israel, enabling them to commune with God, is a seed which is eternally fructifying in his descendants. We, Israelites of to-day, carry this seed of Divinity within our breasts. We all of us have the possibility of that communion with God, which was a characteristic possession of the prophet. The prophet possessed it, because he rendered himself worthy of possessing it. He reached the stage of communion with God after a life-long effort to live in the highest order of moral purity and intellectuality. The same high consummation may be ours if only we constitute our lives after the same exalted pattern. If there be found among us here and there any who have attained such a fellowship with God, then they stand in the same category as the prophet.⁽¹⁾

Now, to sum up. In what ways does Jehuda Ha-Levi throw light upon the Rabbinic doctrines of Prophecy and Holy Spirit? In the following ways:—

(a) He uses the phrase *שְׁלָמָה מִנָּה* in the sense of a Divine emanation, a Divine outflowing to man. This

is clearly but a natural development of the *הַרְוחַ קָדוֹשׁ*, Holy Spirit.

(b) The “Inyan” must be possessed by man before prophecy is possible. The Rabbins say the same of the Holy Spirit.

(c) The “Inyan” can be possessed not only by the recognised prophet but by all men who make themselves morally and intellectually and bodily fit to receive it. It must be striven after. The Rabbins say the same of the Holy Spirit. They attribute its possession to many others besides the traditional prophets; and they make its coming dependent upon the accumulated moral worth of the recipient.

(d) There were times when the “Inyan” was an inward endowment of the whole Israelite nation; and the return of such a time should be the ideal of Israel in all ages. The Rabbins oftentimes speak of the Holy Spirit as pervading the whole of Israel, or as forsaking the whole of Israel.

(e) The Shechinah in Jehuda Ha-Levi’s system has the closest connexion with prophecy and the “Inyan.” Prophecy found its home, its only home, in Palestine, because the latter was the land of the Shechinah *par excellence*. The obvious inference is that the Jew can only hope to reach that high stage of perfection enabling him to be as the prophet, *i.e.* to have real communion with God, by dwelling once again on the land where the Shechinah dwelt. That all this has the closest affinity with Rabbinic doctrine, is too obvious to need dwelling upon here.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII

(1) See on this subject Volz, *Der Geist Gottes* (Tübingen, 1910), pp. 78-80.

(2) See article "Prophetic Literature," in Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

(3) Volz (*op. cit.*) on p. 79 describes prophecy as embracing "ekstatische Verzückung, Weissagung, begeisterte Rede, übernatürliche Erkenntniss w.dgl." Volz here also quotes several interesting passages from the *Antiquities of Josephus*, in which the latter historian ascribes the prophetic ecstasy to several Biblical characters, such as Saul, David, etc.

(3a) On this question of activity and passivity in prophecy, Volz draws an apt contrast between the views held by the Palestinian Rabbis and the Alexandrian Jewish scholars on the subject. He remarks (p. 81): "Man reflektiert jetzt über die Passivität des Offenbarungsorgans, wobei die Rabbiner den Propheten stärkere Selbständigkeit zumessen, während der Alexandriner wohl unter dem Einfluss der ihn umgebenden Erscheinungen die Passivität betont." As an instance of the Rabbinic "Selbständigkeit" he quotes T. B. Sanhedrin 89a : בראן אדור עלה לכהן בעאים אין שי נבאים במנון אחר. "One style of thought (i.e. according to Rashi, 'one style of expression by the Holy Spirit') enters several prophets; but no two prophets prophesy in one style." In other words, the prophet is passive in his reception of the spirit of prophecy, hence all prophets are alike in this respect; but in giving out the message, the prophet is active and moulds the message according to his own will. As an instance of the other view he quotes Philo. In his "Who is the Heir to Divine Things" (ii. 52) Philo says: "For a prophet says nothing of his own, but everything which he says is strange and prompted by some one else. . . . He alone is a sounding instrument of God's voice, being struck and moved to sound in an invisible manner by him." Again, in par. 53, speaking of inspiration, he says: "For the mind that is in us is removed from its place at the arrival of the Divine Spirit, but is again restored to its previous habitation when that spirit departs; for it is contrary to holy law for what is mortal to dwell with what is immortal." He quotes several other passages in which Philo speaks in the same strain. Interesting in this connexion is the passage in Josephus which runs: "Thus did Balaam speak by inspiration, as not being in his own power, but moved to say what he did by the Divine Spirit" (*Antiquities*, Book iv. ch. vi. 5). In the same paragraph Josephus makes Balaam reply to Balak as follows: "O Balak, if thou rightly considerest this whole matter, canst thou suppose that it is in our power to be silent, or to say anything when the spirit of God seizes upon us? For He puts such words as He pleases in our mouths and such discourses as we are not ourselves conscious of?"

(4) There is another fact about Maimonides, which to my mind stamps him as a mystic, viz. the view he takes concerning certain miracles of Scripture. He regards the wrestling of Jacob with an angel, the speaking of Balaam's ass, the translation of Ezekiel from Babylon to Jerusalem (*Ezekiel viii. 3*), Isaiah's walking naked and barefoot (*Isaiah xx. 2*) as things which had no exterior reality at all, but as mere subjective experiences, visions, dreams in the brain of the prophets themselves. A rationalist would either deny the truth of these things altogether or he would try to interpret them on natural grounds.

(5) M. Friedländer, *Guide of the Perplexed*, i. p. lxx. Introduction.

(6) For a further searching criticism of this theory of Maimonides see the commentary of Nahmanides on Genesis xviii. 2. The latter makes use of such an unsparing remark as: ואלה הربורים טהורים הכהוב ואסא לשובם אף בלילה אמר בהלם "Words like these [of Maimonides] contradict Scripture. It is forbidden to give ear to them, much more to believe in them." Nahmanides draws the distinction between seeing an angel or hearing the words of an angel, and the state of mind which is a concomitant of prophecy. The former, he says, is comprehended by the subject when in a state of vision or dream. But not the latter. And the two states are utterly distinct from one another. Abarbanel on chap. xlvi. of second book of the *Moreh* defends Maimonides against these strictures of Nahmanides.

(7) Jehuda Ha - Levi concludes this argument (Book ii. 14) with a passage bristling with similes of the boldest type. He says: *הענין האללי כמו צופה למי שראוי להרבך בו וכו'* "The Divine Principle waits, as it were, for him to whom it is meet that it should attach itself, so that it should become his God, as was the case with the prophets and the saints. It is just the same as the Active Intelligence which waits for him whose natural powers have reached perfection, and whose soul and moral qualities have reached that stage of equilibrium which enables the Active Intelligence to apply itself to them in the way of perfection. It is just as the soul which waits for its entry into the foetus until the latter's vital powers are sufficiently completed to enable it to receive this higher state of things. It is in just the same way as Nature herself waits for a temperate climate, in order that she might exert her effect upon the soil and produce vegetation."

CHAPTER XIX

HOLY SPIRIT AND PROPHECY FROM THE RABBINIC STANDPOINT (2)

ENOUGH has now been said to show the close affinity between the Holy Spirit and Prophecy, and how the Rabbins for this reason attributed the prophetic faculty to a far wider circle of individuals than those whom we are accustomed to regard as prophets in the light of O.T. teaching on the subject. Detailed illustrations must now be given.⁽¹⁾

In Genesis Rabba xxxvii. 7 we read : "R. Simeon b. Gamliel said, The first fathers (*i.e.* Shem, Eber, Peleg, etc., mentioned in Genesis x.) owing to the fact that they employed the medium of the Holy Spirit, used to name their children (at birth) after the name of some event (לשם התרוץ), but we who do not employ the medium of the Holy Spirit name our children after the names of our grandparents ("לשם אבותינו")." The allusion is to the statement that Peleg (Genesis x. 25) was so named "because in his days was the earth divided." But, as one of the commentators on this Midrash points out, this division of the earth happened when Peleg was grown up; therefore his name at birth must have been a prophetic anticipation on the part of his father. This prophetic power was possessed by all the *ראשונים*, *i.e.* the Noachide families. They saw into the future, hence they could keep alive

the memory of any coming event by embodying it in a name. But Simeon b. Gamliel denies the possession of this prophetic power by the Holy Spirit in his own days, hence it was only the past that could be immortalised in a name, not the future. The Midrash follows up the statement by the remark, "R. José b. Ḥalafta said Eber was a great prophet." But the fact that Simeon b. Gamliel speaks of the non-existence of the Holy Spirit in his day is surprising when put by the side of other statements emanating from about the same date which show that it decidedly did exist. Of course it is difficult to say which Simeon b. Gamliel is meant here. There were two of that name. Simeon b. Gamliel I. was President of the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem in the last two decades before the destruction of the Temple. Simeon b. Gamliel II. was a Tanna of the third generation, and, as we gather from T. B. *Sotah* 49b and parallel passages, he lived at the time of the Bar Kochba revolt, *i.e.* the second century A.D. Now, in *Leviticus Rabba* xxi. 8, we get the phrase in the midst of a peculiar anecdote, *צפה ר' עקיבא ברוח הקודש*, "R. Akiba saw by the Holy Spirit." Akiba's dates, roughly, are from A.D. 50-130. If, then, our Simeon be he who lived before the destruction of the Temple, it seems strange that the Holy Spirit being already then extinct, it should be said to reappear in a man who lived after that time. If, however, he be the Simeon who lived at the time of Bar Kochba, then his dates are practically identical with those of Akiba. Why, then, should the Holy Spirit have been extinct in the one case while it was extant in the other? Again, in *Leviticus Rabba* xxxvii. 3 (cp. T. B. *Erubin* 64a, *Jerusalem Talmud Aboda Zara*, chap. i.) Gamliel II. "sees by the Holy Spirit." He lived at the beginning of the second

century A.D. I have already quoted R. Meir in this connexion. He too belongs to the second century A.D. The explanation of the difficulty seems to be this : Holy Spirit is employed in Rabbinic literature as an adjunct to prophecy in three distinct senses. Firstly, it is a Divine emanation which inspired the recognised prophets of the O.T. and the writers of all the books included in the O.T. canon. Secondly, it inspired with a sort of prophetic sense several miscellaneous characters not only in O.T. Scripture but after the close of the canon. Thirdly, it is a Divine endowment akin to prophecy which any one may attain provided he lives the life which leads up to this high state of moral, religious, and intellectual perfection. It is not merely a thing of the past. God's revelation of Himself is not confined to any particular period of human history. The worthy man in any age can reach the highest stage of communion with God. For this highest stage of communion is rendered possible, because God's Holy Spirit is immanent in man ; thus, man can reach this ideal in any age, provided only that his merits warrant it.

R. Simeon b. Gamliel in the statement attributed to him above, is clearly using the phrase בָּרוּחַ מְשֻׁתְּמִין זֶה קָדוֹם in the first of the three senses. With the destruction of the second Temple, canonical prophecy ceased. Nay, it ceased many years before the destruction, so that whether our Simeon b. Gamliel be he who lived two decades before the destruction of the Temple, or he who lived at the time of the Bar Kochba revolt is really immaterial to the argument. The *locus classicus*, whence is derived the theory of the cessation of prophecy in the time of the second Temple, is the following statement, which occurs many times in different parts of Rabbinical literature :

"חמשה דברים שהיה בבית האחרון חסר מן הראשון וכו'" (Song of Songs Rabba viii. see Note (2), p. 267), "Five things which existed in the first Temple were lacking in the second. These were (*a*) Fire from on High, (*b*) Anointing Oil, (*c*) the Ark, (*d*) Holy Spirit, (*e*) the Urim and Thummim."⁽²⁾ That the Holy Spirit is here an allusion to canonical prophecy is seen from a parallel remark which likewise occurs with great frequency: משפטנו נביאים אחרים רוח הקודש מלנכי פסקה ונראה, "With the death of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi the Holy Spirit ceased in Israel."⁽³⁾ The Rabbins regarded these three as the only prophets of the second Temple. Their deaths probably occurred in the early days of the second Temple's existence; hence the statement that the "Holy Spirit" was wanting in the second Temple.

The second sense of Holy Spirit is found in passages such as the following:—

Most of the prominent characters, men and women, in the Book of Genesis "foresaw" by the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* the possession of the Holy Spirit meant the ability to prophesy. Yalkut on Genesis xvi. attributes it to Sarai, thus: "And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai, *i.e.* to the voice of the Holy Spirit within her." By the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit, Sarai foresaw that Abram's taking Hagar to wife would result in the birth of a son.

Genesis xxvii. 42 reads, "And these words of Esau her elder son were told to Rebekah." Who told her? Midrash Rabba on this passage answers by saying, "The mothers (*i.e.* the wives of the patriarchs) were prophetesses." Rashi, however, on the passage says, "It was told her by the Holy Spirit." Now, Rashi frequently quotes from Rabbinic sources without mentioning that they are Rabbinic. I cannot, however,

find this passage in any of the Midrashim to which I have access. Accordingly the remark is to be regarded as Rashi's own interpretation of the Midrash Rabba passage. And it proves my point. It proves that in Rashi's mind, Holy Spirit and Prophecy were interchangeable terms. Another interesting reference is verse 45 in the same chapter of Genesis, "Why should I be deprived also of you both in one day?" Rashi on the passage here remarks, "ר' נורקה בה וכרי, "The Holy Spirit cast itself within her [i.e. took possession of her] and she prophesied." Rashi gives his source as T. B. *Sotah* 13a. What do we read in the latter? The words נתקיימה נבוארהה של רבקה, "the prophecy of Rebekah was fulfilled." The Rabbins deduce from certain data that Jacob and Esau met their death on one and the same day (or rather, that the burial of both took place on the same day), and that Rebekah in her exclamation "Why should I be deprived also of you both in one day?" had a sort of prophetic dread that the death of both her sons would happen on the same day. This point is merely to show how, to Rashi, there is an identity between the possession of Holy Spirit and the gift of prophecy.

Genesis Rabba lxxv. 8, commenting on Genesis xxviii. 1, pertinently asks the question, Why does Isaac give his son a second blessing, seeing that he had already invoked upon him the blessing of Heaven in the preceding chapter? The Midrash gets out of the difficulty by saying that "Isaac sees by the Holy Spirit that his sons would one day be exiled among the nations. He therefore says to his son Jacob, 'Come and let me give thee the blessings of exile.⁽⁴⁾ May God return to thee and gather thee from the places of thy captivity.'" Genesis Rabba lxx. 12, commenting on Genesis xxix. 11, says, "Why did Jacob weep when he kissed Rachel?

It was because he foresaw by the Holy Spirit that he would not lie with her in burial."

Genesis Rabba lxxxiv. 19, commenting on the words "an evil beast hath devoured him" (Genesis xxxvii. 38), says: "The Holy Spirit gleamed (*נצחנה*) within him; the evil spirit was the wife of Potiphar, i.e. Jacob prophetically declared, by this remark about an evil beast, the coming calamity to Joseph in connexion with Potiphar's wife.

An interesting reference to the association between Holy Spirit, Shechinah, Prophecy, and Urim and Thummim is afforded by a passage in T. B. Yoma 71b: "Every priest who spoke by the Holy Spirit, and upon whom the Shechinah rested, consulted the Urim and Thummim successfully" (i.e. all the priests who had not these qualifications received no assistance from the Urim and Thummim). Zadok (2 Samuel xv.) and Abiathar are given as instances. The former had the necessary qualifications of Holy Spirit and Shechinah. The latter had not. As Rashi on the passage says, Zadok was a *כשר כהן*, "a worthy priest," otherwise the Shechinah and Holy Spirit would not have rested upon him. It is exceedingly difficult to differentiate here between the meaning of "speaking by the Holy Spirit" and "the Shechinah resting upon any one." The latter phrase possibly refers to the inspiration of prophecy and the capacity to utter it; the former alludes to what causes this capacity, viz. the fact of being filled with the Presence of God. Thus, it was only he who already possessed the equipment of prophecy, that could reap any benefit from the Urim and Thummim. The method of consultation by the Urim and Thummim is given in several Talmudic and Midrashic passages, e.g. Yoma 73b; Sanhedrin 16a; Baba Bathra 122a; Targum Jonathan on Exodus xxviii. 30; Sifri Numbers

141, etc. From all these passages it can be generally inferred, that the Urim and Thummim were regarded by the Rabbins as a materialised conception of the Presence of God under the guise of light. It had close affinity to Shechinah, which was familiarly conceived as a mysterious light; the Rabbinic explanation of the word "Urim" as "those whose words give light" substantiates the argument.⁽⁵⁾ The whole matter, then, amounts to what has been said previously, viz. that it is only he who has previously sought God that can find Him. The priest, in order to receive the prophetic message from the Divine Light, must previously have cultivated the art of prophecy. This he could only do by ordering his life after such an exalted standard that the Holy Spirit could find lodgment in him.

Yalkut on Song of Songs i. 11 declares that Jacob on his death-bed by means of the Holy Spirit gave his sons a prophetic forecast of the Tabernacle, and even commanded them concerning the making of "the middle bar" (Exodus xxvi. 28).

That Holy Spirit and Prophecy should associate themselves in all sorts of ways and degrees round the person of Moses in Rabbinical literature, is only to be expected. It is, however, worth quoting here, an illustration of the lengths to which the Rabbins at times went in some of their assertions. It is in Midrash Tanhuma on ב' תבואה פ': "Moses looked by means of the Holy Spirit and foresaw that the Temple would one day be laid in ruins, and that the bringing of the first-fruits would cease; he therefore arose and instituted for Israel the three daily Prayers; because prayer is more beloved before God than all good deeds and than all sacrifices, for so it is written, Let my prayer be set before Thee as incense,

and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice (Psalm cxli. 2)." This, by the way, is inconsistent with the oft-repeated Rabbinic saying that the three daily Prayers were instituted by the three Patriarchs of Genesis. Yalkut on Joshua vii. (from Jerusalem Talmud Sanhedrin vi.) makes Joshua at the very outset of his career foresee by the Holy Spirit that he would be called upon one day to divide the Holy Land by lot among the tribes.

Ruth Rabba ii. (repeated in Yalkut on Deuteronomy chap. i.) attributes the spirit of prophecy by means of the Holy Spirit to Rahab who hid the spies, otherwise how could she have foreseen that the pursuers would return after exactly three days? This ascription of the Holy Spirit to Rahab, who is described in Joshua ii. as a harlot, might seem strange. But the Rabbins make out Rahab to have become a proselyte to Judaism after the capture of Jericho. She married Joshua, and became the ancestress of a line of priests and of prophets, of whom Jeremiah was one (T. B. Megillah 14b).

Yalkut on 1 Samuel chap. i. 28, "As long as he liveth he shall be lent (**לְנַשֵּׁת**) to the Lord," says that at the moment she uttered this remark, Hannah was inspired with the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, this remark of hers was a prophecy. The Hebrew for "lent" is the same as the Hebrew for "Saul." So that what Hannah prophesied was, "As long as he liveth there shall be a Saul to the Lord," i.e. Hannah prophesied the rise of Saul, who would live as long as Samuel and survive him.

Tanhuma on **רֹפֶרֶת** makes Solomon prophesy by the Holy Spirit the death of certain workmen sent him by Pharaoh Necho to aid in the construction of the Temple.

Yalkut on 2 Samuel xx. 22 makes David foresee

by the Holy Spirit that Mordecai would be descended from Shimei who had “cursed him with a grievous curse.” This was the reason why David pardoned Shimei.

Yalkut on 2 Kings ii. says as follows⁽⁶⁾: “Before the time of Elijah’s disappearance, the Holy Spirit was abundant in Israel, as it is said, ‘And the sons of the prophets that were at Bethel came forth to Elisha, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?’ They then went and stood afar off and crossed the Jordan. I might have thought that they were few in number! Therefore it is said, ‘And fifty men of the sons of the prophets’ (verse 7). I might have thought that they were ignorant men (*חָדִישִׁים*). Therefore it is said, ‘thy master,’ *אָדוֹנֶךָ*. It is not said ‘our master,’ but ‘thy master.’ This shows that they were as wise as Elisha, but when Elijah was taken away, the Holy Spirit departed from them, as it is said (verse 16), ‘And they said unto him, Behold now, there be with thy servants fifty strong men (*i.e.* not, as before, fifty men of the sons of the prophets, but merely men of physical prowess); let them go, we pray thee, and seek thy master (*i.e.* not as before ‘our master,’ but ‘thy master’). This teaches that the Holy Spirit had by then departed from them.”

The close association, in the Rabbinic opinion, between Prophecy and Holy Spirit, is a point of great importance to the student of early Christianity. From the remark that “the Holy Spirit was abundant in Israel” it is to be inferred, that the world did not have to wait till the wondrous times of the birth of Christ to see an outburst of prophetic power among men.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIX

(1) See what Volz says on this point (pp. 116, 117): "So scheint es doch unwiderlegbar, dass die grössten Rabbinen Pneumatiker waren. Sie hatten das pneumatische Element in sich, in ihnen lebte das prophetische Feuer, die wunderbare Weisheit, die göttliche Frömmigkeit; von der Dingen der Welt los, konzentrierte sich ihre Seele auf den geistigen Beruf. . ." Volz goes on to give instances of the Rabbinic ascription of the prophetic power to many a Rabbi of the time, and he associates with this the many recorded instances of the wonder-working powers of certain Rabbis. Thus, he points to the passage in Jerusalem Talmud Schebiit ix. 38d where R. Simeon b. Yohai when in a subterranean hiding-place could divine what was going on outside. Also to T. B. Ta'anith 25b where rain falls at the intervention of Akiba; to T. B. Berachoth 34b where R. Hanina b. Dosa, by prayer, heals the son of Gamliel the son of Johanan b. Zakkai. In T. B. Yoma 39b Johanan b. Zakkai prophesies the fall of the Temple forty years ahead; and Simeon the Just prophesies, from a certain fact that had befallen him on the Day of Atonement, that the coming year would be his last. Volz gives many more examples.

(2) This passage of בְּרִית מֹשֶׁה not only recurs with frequency but also with differing wording. In T. B. Yoma 21b the "anointing oil" is left out of the list and "Shechinah" is substituted. In Numbers Rabba xv. 10 the word יָמַנִּים, "which were concealed," is used. This points to the belief in the future restoration of the five. Also in place of the "anointing oil" and "Urim and Thummim" we get the "candlestick" and "cherubim." Whether these variations are merely accidental as being due to error, or whether they point to an original larger list of which these form but a part, or whether they reveal an identity of interpretation in the case of some of the terms, is a matter for the investigator.

(3) See T. B. Sukkah 48a; Sanhedrin 11a; Song of Songs Rabba viii.

(4) Quoted also in Yalkut on Micah v.

(5) For a concise description of Urim and Thummim and a good summary of the various views held by scholars, as well as the relations to Babylonian oracular consultations, the student should see Kennedy's article "Urim and Thummim" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

(6) Drawn by the Yalkut from Tosefta Sotah, xii. 5.

CHAPTER XX

HOLY SPIRIT AS IDEAL

So far I have shown how, in the theology of the Rabbins, the possession of the Holy Spirit was the highest spiritual equipment of certain distinguished Biblical characters, of the authors of the Books of the O.T., of prophet, prophetess, king, and sage. But, as I have already hinted, the Rabbins did not relegate the possibilities of the Holy Spirit to any one particular section of time. Although strongly particularist in many respects, there were others in which they were emphatically universalist. This is one of them. The possession of the Holy Spirit was not, for them, limited to the past ; neither was it the exclusive property of their own time. It was a gift from God for all time, which every one could attain to, provided he used the right means. And they expressed this as a doctrine in the "imperative mood" as the grammarians would say. They laid it down as an axiom that it is the religious obligation of every Israelite to so sanctify his life that he should be worthy of becoming possessed of God's Holy Spirit. It is the supreme religious ideal which every Jew must strive to realise. His first aim must, therefore, be to make his physical life holy. Man must think of his body as well as of his soul. In the opinion of the Rabbins, every physical imperfection or derangement of the organism,

as e.g. sorrow, pain, etc., acted as a bar against the accession of the Holy Spirit.

This last idea brings us face to face with one distinguishing characteristic of Rabbinical ethics, viz. the importance of the body in the leading of a holy life. The body is God's, say the Rabbins, as well as the soul. Hence, to be perfect as they understood perfection, means to be sound both physically and spiritually. And hence, any action which inflicts pain or deprivation upon the body, is stigmatised as sinful. Thus T. B. Ta'anith 11a, 22b declares, "He who subjects himself to needless fasting and self-castigations, or even denies himself the enjoyment of wine, is a sinner." The Jerusalem Talmud Kiddushin iv. Halacha ii. says, "Account will be taken from man for every lawful enjoyment he refuses." Leviticus Rabba xxxiv. 3 gives this teaching in anecdote form. Hillel takes a bath and declares that he is performing a religious act. "How is this?" ask his disciples. "Well," answers Hillel, "at all theatres you will see the statues of kings. These are regularly and industriously washed and cleansed by men who receive a great reward for so doing. Now, my body is created in the image and after the pattern of God. If the image of a mere human king claims such assiduous devotion, how much more so ought the image of the Almighty King of Kings?"

Such then being the ethical outlook of the authors of the Rabbinical literature, it is easy to see why they should have denied the Holy Spirit to man or nation when they are in a state of physical imperfection. Genesis Rabba xci. 6 says, "From the day Joseph was stolen, the Holy Spirit departed from Jacob." Sorrow is a bodily imperfection. The highest ethic demands a bodily perfection as its first condition. Hence the grief-stricken man cannot conform to the

highest ethic. He is thus repugnant to the Holy Spirit. When, however, Jacob receives the happy tidings that his son is still alive, then "his spirit revives" (Genesis xlvi. 27), *i.e.* says Aboth De R. Nathan xxx., "the Holy Spirit returns to him."

Yalkut on 2 Samuel xxii. quotes the following from the Tanna Debe Elijahu Rabba ii. : "During the twenty-two years that the Holy Spirit left David, King of Israel, David used to shed tears every day, etc. etc. . . . until at last he showed true repentance, when the Holy Spirit came back again to him." The cause of this departure of the Holy Spirit, was his sin with Bathsheba. Sin is here looked upon, as a physical, as well as a spiritual, defect. The man who has sinned, has rendered himself organically imperfect, as it were. There is a passage in T. B. Yoma 22b which speaks of David being afflicted, on account of his offence with Bathsheba, with leprosy, for a space of half a year, during which time he was abandoned by his own court (פָּרַשׁ מִן־סְנָהָרִין), and also by the Holy Spirit. David's sin is followed by a bodily affliction — to the Rabbins suffering was the consequence of previous sin—and his bodily organism being thus tainted with an imperfection, he was *ipso facto* rendered incapable of receiving the Holy Spirit.

Genesis Rabba lx. 3 (quoted also in Tanhumah on בְּהֵדָקָת) speaks of the Holy Spirit as departing from Phinehas as a consequence of his sin in connexion with the daughter of Jephthah. What the sin was, is given in these Midrashic passages, as well as in T. B. Ta'anith 4b. There is the same idea here, of sin as physical imperfection.

Yalkut Esther v. 2 says of Esther: "When she approached the abode of idolatry [*i.e.* in the palace of Ahasuerus] the Holy Spirit departed from her, and she exclaimed, My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken

me? Why art Thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring? (Psalm xxii. 1)." Here again the taint caused by an approach to an abode of sin constitutes not only a spiritual, but also a bodily, infirmity. Hence the Holy Spirit departs from Esther. The verse from Psalm xxii. is interesting to the student of the Gospels.

Such, then, are the physical or moral imperfections which impede the Holy Spirit. A pure uncorrupted soul in a pure uncorrupted body—such is the only soil congenial to it. The best and worthiest in Israel's past *did* realise this exalted pitch of spiritual perfection. The best and worthiest in the Israel of all time have the possibility of realising it; and the Holy Spirit will rest upon them too. It must be the ideal striven after.

Many of the Rabbinical passages treat Holy Spirit from this standpoint.

First place must be given to the celebrated dictum of R. Phinehas b. Jair (second century A.D.). It is in T. B. Abodah Zarah 20b; and with some slight variants in Mishna Sotah ix. 15. Phinehas is a firm believer in man's perfectibility; step by step he can ascend the ladder of purity, until he reaches the highest consummation, viz. Holy Spirit (which leads to Resurrection of Dead). His laconic utterance is as follows: "The Torah leads to carefulness (*זָהָרֶת*), carefulness to diligence (*זְרִיזָה*), diligence to cleanliness (*נְקָדָה*), cleanliness to abstemiousness (*פְּרִישָׁה*), abstemiousness to purity (*טָהָרָה*), purity to piety (*חֲסִידָה*), piety to humility (*עַנוּתָה*), humility to fear of sin (*יִרְאָה חַטֹּאת*), fear of sin to holiness (*קָדוּשָׁה*), holiness to the Holy Spirit (*בָּרוּךְ*), Holy Spirit to the Resurrection of the Dead."

The programme of R. Phinehas is ingenious. The terms he uses require more than a little elucidation.

A whole volume has been written on them, viz. the *Mesillat Yesharim* of Moses Hayyim Luzzatto. There are three points particularly germane to our special subject. They are:—

(1) It is noteworthy what a large part the physical element plays here—the point previously alluded to. The first condition of spirituality is bodily purity.

(2) The scale of discipline is such, that it is given to every man to go through the stages successfully, if only he wills it. Every man may become possessed of the Holy Spirit. It is the culmination of what the religious life should mean in the case of each individual living it. It is the goal to be held ever in view. It is withheld from no one who wins it.

(3) The statement that Holy Spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, is not easily intelligible. The opinion of Luzzatto throws light upon it, however. The possession of Holy Spirit, says he, leads man to the state of spiritual exaltedness of men like Elijah and Elisha who, according to the Scriptural narrative, were able to resurrect the dead. These men were sharers in the Divine nature to such an extent that they, as it were, took on one of the great prerogatives of God, viz. to impart life. God places His Holy Spirit in every man worthy of it, and the man thus dowered reaches a height of spirituality which, while at no point lifting him out of the sphere of mortality, yet raises him to that exalted level where the close kinship between the human and the divine is most clearly manifested.

Leviticus Rabba xxxv. 7 has the following saying: "He who learns with the intention of practically carrying out his learning, will merit the receiving of the Holy Spirit." "Learning," of course, refers to the Torah. If any saying illustrates the widest possible

dissemination of Holy Spirit, it is this one here quoted. It is in the power of every one to study Torah. Nay more, it is every one's paramount duty to do so, based on the phrase, "And thou shalt meditate therein day and night" (Josh. i. 8). But no right-minded man will fail to put theory into practice; his study will aid him to a more acceptable execution of his religious and moral obligations. This is the aim of all culture. The man possessed of Torah-culture in this sense, will receive the Holy Spirit. And its attainment lies in every one's power.

Tanhuma on וְהִלְלָךְ places the acquisition of Holy Spirit on other grounds: "From here thou mayest learn that whoever sacrifices himself for Israel's sake will, in the future, receive the merit of honour, greatness, and the Holy Spirit." The incentive to this remark is worth noting. The Rabbinic comment on Numbers xi. 16-17 is as follows: Moses is bidden to gather seventy men who are to bear with him "the burden of the people." He does not know whom to choose and whom not. God tells him, thereupon, to choose those "whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them." These officers (*מִרְשָׁנִים*), say the Rabbins, were they of whom it was said, "And the officers of the children of Israel, which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten" (Exod. v. 14). They were the officers who showed such exemplary self-sacrifice, at that dark period of Israel's history, by permitting themselves to be flogged rather than let their subordinates suffer. For when the Egyptian taskmaster found the tale of the bricks defective, the Hebrew officer took the blame on himself rather than betray any of his people—so the Tanhuma legend. Moses selects these elders and officers, and God places some of the spirit which is upon Moses, upon them.

This was the reward for their altruism. And this is the reward, say the sages in our passage, which is sure to come at all times and in every age to him who shows the same self-sacrificing zeal for his people's welfare. The patriotic ideal could not be placed on a nobler basis than this.

The word "faith" (*אמונה*) or "belief" is not found with any frequency in Rabbinical literature. But of the few sayings concerning faith which are found in Rabbinic literature, those of Mechilta on the words "And they believed in the Lord and in Moses His servant" (p. 33 of Friedmann's edition) are most striking. A saying which concerns our present subject is : "R. Nehemiah says, Whosoever taketh upon himself one precept in faith is worthy that the Holy Spirit should rest upon him."⁽¹⁾ Faith is here set down as one of the main avenues leading to the Holy Spirit. R. Nehemiah's utterance need not necessarily be confined to Jews alone. Let only all men of any nation whatsoever, take upon themselves the doing of one precept in faith—and this potentiality is in accord with many an O.T. ideal—and we shall then have that universal outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh which is prophesied by Joel (iii. 1-2). This is certainly a realisable ideal.

NOTE TO CHAPTER XX

(1) It is an interesting study to compare this Mechilta passage on Faith with that of Hebrews xi.

CHAPTER XXI

HOLY SPIRIT IN ITS RELATION TO NON-JEWS

THOUGH there is a strong particularist tendency in the Rabbinic doctrines of the Holy Spirit, there are not wanting indications of a universalistic treatment of the question. The Rabbins did at times, under certain conditions, enunciate the broad idea of God out-reaching the bounds of the Jew and consenting to find His sanctuary among men generally. Illustrations are :—

A remarkable passage in Numbers Rabba xx. 1 where the Midrash actually places the non-Israelite prophet on an equality with the Israelite prophet in respect of the possession of the Holy Spirit. Commenting on the verse in Deuteronomy xxxii., "He is the Rock, His work is perfect; for all His ways are judgment," it remarks, "God did not place in the mouths of the nations what would serve them as a plea for the future, enabling them to say, Why hast Thou kept us far away? But what did He do? Just as He raised up kings, sages, and prophets from the Israelites, so He raised up these from the nations generally." As we have seen from previous remarks, Holy Spirit always went hand in hand with prophecy, in Rabbinic theology. It is quite true that the Midrash here, as in several other places, contrasts the defects of the heathen prophets with the virtues of the Israelite prophet, but the very fact that the Rabbins thought the former worthy of the

name of prophet, is important. They even place Moses and Balaam on one and the same pedestal! Thus, “God raised up Moses for Israel and Balaam for the idolaters.”⁽¹⁾ But Balaam proved himself unworthy of the Holy Spirit: he misapplied it to the attempted detriment of Israel. It was for the latter reason, says this extraordinary Midrash, that God finally withdrew His Holy Spirit from non-Israelites. *לֹךְ נִכְתָּבָה פ'* בַּלְעָם לְהֹזֵיעַ לִמְהָ סָלָק. *הַקְבָּה ר' הַמֶּג'* נָוָם שָׁה עַמְדָם וּרְאָה מָה עֲשָׂה. The peculiarity of this Midrash is that it attributes the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles, as well as to the Gentile prophets. But the former had it only temporarily. At what time they lost it, it is impossible to tell.

Balaam's extraordinary career is thus described (Numbers Rabba xx. 7): “At first he was an interpreter of dreams; from this, he turned to become a diviner; from the latter, again, he turned to become a participator in the Holy Spirit.” Thus, the most distinguished of the prophets of heathendom, stood as near God as did the most distinguished among the ancient prophets of Israel.

There is, however, one little modification in the Rabbinic teaching on this head—viz. that Balaam and all pagan prophets (*i.e.* non-Israelite) were only in possession of the Holy Spirit at night. Thus, in Leviticus Rabba i. 13, R. José says that God only revealed Himself to the heathens at night. This is an allusion to the possession of the Holy Spirit by Eliphaz—a non-Israelite. Also, pagan prophets only enjoyed *חַצֵּי דְבָר*, “half the Divine Word,” whereas Israelite prophets were the recipients of “the complete word.” But, anyhow, the great fact remains, that non-Jews were, in certain senses, considered by the Rabbins as sharers in the act of closest Divine communion which is connoted by the phrase “Holy Spirit.”⁽²⁾

Yalkut on Judges iv. 4, quoting from the Tanna Debe Elijahu Rabba, says: "I bring heaven and earth to witness that the Holy Spirit dwells on a non-Jew as well as upon a Jew, upon a woman as well as upon a man, upon maid-servant as well as man-servant. All depends upon the works of the particular individual." Of course, account must be taken of the fact that the Tanna Debe Elijahu (both the Rabba and the Zuta) are among the latest of the Midrashim, their date of redaction being about the end of the tenth century.⁽³⁾

Needless to say, in any consideration of this subject, regard must be had for the historical background of the Rabbinical literature. It is necessary to think of the Maccabean revolution, the struggle against Hellenism, the rise against Rome in the days of both Titus and Hadrian. Times fraught with so much trouble and suffering to the Jews, can hardly be expected to enshrine the broadest-minded literary expressions about the "nearness" of God to the non-Jew.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XXI

(1) Cp. a far greater statement by R. Meir in T. B. Aboda Zara 26a, viz.: "A non-Jew who is learned in the Torah is as great as the High Priest."

(2) Cp. Sifri on Deut. xxxiv. 10, "There arose no prophet in Israel like Moses, but there arose such an one among the nations. He was Balaam."

(3) See Lector Friedmann's scholarly editions of *Seder Eliahu Rabba* and *Seder Eliahu Zuta*, with annotations referring to all branches of Rabbinical literature, and an exhaustive introduction dealing with the relations of these Midrashim to preceding works. Vienna, 1900 and 1903.

CHAPTER XXII

THE GENERAL RABBINIC CONCEPTION OF GOD

It has now, I hope, sufficiently been proved that Rabbinic theology is deeply ingrained with a mystical element. The quintessential feature of all mysticism—the belief in the Immanence of God—is a characteristic of the Rabbinic Judaism. The incoming of God into human life, the implanting of the Divine life within the human soul, the permanent presence of the Divine Spirit accompanying, or acting in fellowship with, a whole body of men or a whole race,—I have quoted sufficient illustrations from the vast domains of Talmudic and Midrashic literature to demonstrate the tenacity with which the authors of the latter held these truths, and their unshakable belief in the fact that the people on whose behalf they spoke experienced them. The Shechinah in all its different representations, whether as fire or as cloud or as the wings of a bird, really points to an inward and *first-hand* experience of religion. It denotes the idea that the individual Israelite, or the whole race of Israel, is actually encircled by the mystical presence of God, and lives in a sort of organic union with God. The Jew believed that the Shechinah floated about, as it were, in his environment; in other words, he believed that his God was conjunct with all those of his race and faith who did His will, and thus found refuge in Him;

there was a Divine life circulating through them and expressing itself through them. I have also made it clear, in my long excursus into the various significations of spirit and Holy Spirit, how clearly the Rabbins realised the seed of Divinity which we carry in our breasts. The Holy Spirit is a Divine endowment to man, an emanation of God, which is the originator of the prophetic faculty, and which in the case of all men makes known the will of God, and leads man on to ever higher and higher flights of worthy thought and noble action. It is the medium by which men become aware of the nearness of God, of His Fatherhood, and of His ever-constant accessibility to their desire to hold communion with Him. The numerous illustrations I have adduced, of the graphic manner in which the Holy Spirit is personified by the Rabbins and plays a part in the variegated experiences of life, all go to demonstrate irresistibly, how the idea of the Divine Immanence is woven into the very structure of their fundamental teachings.

Putting aside all the technicalities of the subject which constitute the groundwork on which the arguments have been built, let me now, in the pages that remain, address myself to the broader and more comprehensive aspect of the question. To what general results have these investigations led? On the evidence before us, what are the right findings with reference to the question of the Rabbinic conception of God?

I shall first take the negative side of the answer to the query.

Firstly, the Rabbinic God is not, as Weber and others have insisted, a kind of Absolute, dwelling in impenetrable aloofness from man and the world, merely self-contained and bearing no relation to anything else, a supramundane and therefore extramundane Being, a

transcendent God who made man and the world ages ago, and has long retired from the scene like a superannuated workman, a far-off monarch whom no man has ever seen, and whom none can know because of His unfathomable distance. Assertions like these appear totally groundless, when taken in conjunction with the fruitful crop of the Shechinah and Holy Spirit and Memra teachings which are set forth in this book. Let it suffice to give two quotations which bear directly upon this particular point. In the Mechilta on בשלה (edit. Friedmann, page 41) we read as follows : . . . בָּרוּ וְרָאֵה שֶׁלֹּא נִמְדַּת הַקָּבָה מִדָּת בָּשָׂר וְדָם וּכְךָ "Come, see ! Not as the quality of man is the quality of God. If two persons in distress cry for help at one and the same time to man he cannot hear them (because their combined voices confuse him). But with God, even if all creatures in the universe were to come and pour out their plaints altogether before Him, He would hear all." How can it be said, after reading a passage of this sort, that the Rabbinic God is a far-off Absolute, unrelated to, and having no connexion with, the world ? What more explicit pronouncement could one have as to the accessibility, the nearness, the yearning love, of God the Father, His answering sympathy with the woes of suffering humanity, the everlasting arms capable of supporting the limitless burdens of those who walk in darkness and have no light ? Notice, too, the universalistic spirit of the passage. The Divine love is not for Jews only ; it is for the world. The other reference is T. B. Sabbath 127a as follows : "Come, see ! Not as the quality of man is the quality of God. With man it is impossible for a mean man to say to a great man, 'Wait for me.' But concerning God it is written, 'Pass not away, I pray Thee, from Thy servant.'" There are three elements in the thought here which bring

out our point. These are (1) God's ever-existent accessibility. (2) The nearness of His love and grace to all. It is only a bosom friend whom you love and of whose responsive love you are assured, that you can familiarly ask not to go away from you. (3) God is more condescending to man than even man himself. Rank, age, wealth create barriers between man and man. But man's road to God is so open because so near, and so near because so open. With sentiments like these to its credit, it is clearly a libel to paint the Rabbinical God as an unrelated Absolute or as a distant and unheeding king.

Secondly, the Rabbinic conception of God is not to be rejected as untenable, and as failing to meet the higher demands of the religious consciousness, because it has no dogmas expressing the intercommunication between God and man in the senses conveyed by the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement. With reference to the Atonement, the Rabbins recognise no historic breach between God and man which had such serious consequences for succeeding ages, that man could only grope his way back to the love and forgiveness of God by means of the atoning self-sacrifice of some divine or semi-divine man, at one particular epoch of the world's history. In T. B. Abodah Zarah 22b it is said that "the germ of the [serpent's] poison left the Israelites from the time they stood at the foot of Mount Sinai." This contrasts with the very exceptional references in 4 Esdras iii. 21 and Wisdom ii. 24 which speak of the serpent's poison, or the devil, as being transmitted from Adam to all generations. On the contrary, the Rabbins emphasise untiringly the spotless purity of the newborn babe. "The good inclination," say they, "is thirteen years older than the evil inclination" (because the latter only begins to assert itself at thirteen, the age of

puberty). In fact, the long category of ablutions in connexion with the sacrificial code in the O.T. clearly points not to a continuous state of man's impurity before God, but merely to a temporary impurity, which can be set right at man's will, because it is God's will that it should be so set right. What can be more conclusive on this head than the famous utterance of Akiba: "Happy are ye, O Israelites, in that He before whom ye purify yourselves, and He who cleanses you, is your Father in Heaven"? Here we have the clearest statement of a never-ceasing inflowing of God's grace to man, provided man does his part in yielding himself to God. As for the Incarnation, it can be seen from the chapters on the Holy Spirit, how the Rabbins, by their delineation of the Holy Spirit as an ideal which every one has it in his power to reach, provided he orders his life aright, recognised the divinity of humanity. But they sternly repudiated the converse side of the proposition—the humanity of divinity. One of the chief motives underlying the zealous insistence on the Divine Unity and the pains and penalties attaching to the infringement thereof, is just this safe-guarding against the dangers of clothing the Divine in the garb of the human. Side by side with the words "Shechinah" or "Memra," we get "God's Shechinah," "God's Memra." Why is this? Because the Rabbins never desired that the personification of God intended in these terms—and which had as its object to express the immanent workings of the all-directing, omnipresent, and all-pervading Divine Principle—might be woefully misconstrued into a false identity between man and God. After all, it is only the trained philosopher who can understand what is and what is not included in the connotation of the word "person" as applied to the

Deity. It is not easy to satisfy the man in the street that God can be a person, with all the attributes of personality, and yet be a spirit.

Rabbinical theology presents the truth of the self-communicating love of God to man by quite other, and less highly technical, means. In fact, it is, in this respect, singularly free from elaborate dogmas. It makes many simple, naïve statements which it believes to be true, because they were realised in both the racial and individual consciousness. Thus, the Rabbinic Jew said that God was his ever-constant and never-failing Redeemer—and he said it because he felt it: he felt that there was a Presence about him which overflowed with unmeasured love for him and his people. It was some such rooted conviction as this, which made him declare that the Shechinah accompanied his people in all their pilgrimages, that the Shechinah sustains the sick, that an injury done to a fellow-Israelite is an injury done to the Shechinah, that the Shechinah abides in Israel even in the latter's impurity. And it was a similar axiom of experience that produced the Rabbinic pronouncements on man as a creature formed in the image and likeness of God. A child is formed in the image and likeness of its father. Hence the great Rabbinic doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. A child inherits the father's disposition, the spirit of the one is part of, and corresponds to, the spirit of the other. Hence the doctrine of the Holy Spirit showing that man is related by a real, though mystic, bond to the Divine Father, and showing further that this spark of Divinity, which man can make his own if only he will, is his ceaseless admonisher and stay, his stimulus to what is highest and best, an endowment from on high which makes him akin with the prophets of old. But of this more anon.

Thirdly, the Rabbinic conception of God is not that

of a rigid and narrow legalism. Were it so, there would be no room in it for a spiritual life. It would certainly be bereft of that mystical element which this treatise has shown to preponderate so largely in it. In his article on *Mysticism* in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Prof. Pringle-Pattison says, "The Jewish mind did not lend itself to mysticism because of its rigid monotheism and its turn towards worldly realism and statutory observance"; and again: "Mysticism instinctively recedes from formulas, that have become stereotyped and mechanical, into the perennially fresh experience of the individual." But the professor is here obsessed with the usual errors of the critics of Rabbinism. The "rigid monotheism" of which he complains, is *not* synonymous with a rigid transcendence of Deity. The Rabbinic God *had* contact with the world: He ruled it from within, as well as from without; man's relations to God were not external and accidental; a mystic inner bond existed between them; God was not only viewed as the creator of the cosmos, but as the Shechinah, and the traces of Himself which were embedded in the heart were the workings of the Holy Spirit. There is of course, at first thought, a clashing between the ideas of a religion of "statutory observances," or of "formulas that have become stereotyped and mechanical," and the ideas of a mystical religion. The religion of observances seems to mean mere conformity to outward routine, whereas the mystical religion seems based on the perennially fresh experiences of the inner life of the individual. But it is just the unique character of the Rabbinical religion, that both these sides of religion are emphasised, and to the detriment of neither. Rabbinism is a Religion of Law. It is honeycombed with ceremonial formalism. The Jew who lives under it, can only do his duty to it by fulfilling a great number

of outward ordinances and commands. Obedience to them must be unquestioning. They are the decrees of the King, and only in loyalty to them can the Rabbinic Jew satisfy the demands of his religious consciousness. All this is very true, but it is only a section of Rabbinism; it is not the whole of it. There is a complementary chapter; the movement of man to God and of God to man is conceived as something more than a series of outward acts; there is mysticism as well as ceremonialism; and that the two went hand in hand and never at any point conflicted, is amply proved by the fact, that the abundant crop of teaching about the Shechinah and the Holy Spirit is just as vital a constituent of Rabbinic theology as is the more abundant crop of its legalistic doctrine. There was never any cleavage between the two, to the mind of the Rabbinic Jew. They were warp and woof of one texture. The term "legalism" is really a misnomer. Every act of obedience to the Law had a mystical basis. It was not mere obedience out of fear of consequences. Neither did the obedience spring out of utilitarian motives. "Be ye not like servants," said Antigonos of Socho, "who minister to their master upon the condition of receiving a reward; but be like servants who minister to their master without the condition of receiving a reward." Here lies the gist of Rabbinic mysticism; and although it met with ever so many perversions when put to the touchstone of practice, it is not fair to accept these perversions as the norm and standard. The beauty of any piece of doctrine lies in the highest, not in the lowest, uses to which it can be put. "Peradventure thou mayest say," says the Sifri, "Verily I will learn the Torah in order that I may become rich, or that I may be called 'Rabbi,' or that I may receive a recompense in the future world.

Therefore doth Holy Writ say ‘to love the Lord thy God.’ Let everything that thou doest, be done out of pure love for Him.”

These quotations demonstrate quite sufficiently for our purpose, that what lay at the background of life under the Law, was disinterested love for God. Religion is Law. Religion is Love. Both propositions were true and simultaneously tenable to the Rabbins. By his consciousness of the ever-present and ever-near Shechinah, by his conviction that he carried within his breast an immanent Holy Spirit which, if he proved himself worthy, might raise him even to the status of the prophets, the Rabbinic Jew realised his fellowship with God. And he realised that God reciprocated this fellowship. His human love echoed back the Divine love. So that every outward ceremonial observance which his religion bade him perform was merely the index or symbol of an inward mystical communion with Him in whom “he lived and moved and had his being.”

I turn now to the positive side of the matter. What are the various strata of thought which go to make up the Rabbinical conception of God?

Firstly, the Rabbinic God is both transcendent and immanent. I must here point out the difference between the religion which the Rabbinic Jew derived from his Book (the O.T.), and that which he learnt from his own soul's experiences. In the former he was preponderatingly taught the truth of the Divine Transcendence. But his individual and national experiences brought him round to the truth of the Divine Immanence. The God who sits upon the circle of the earth and views its inhabitants as grasshoppers, underwent a great transformation in the crucible of his mind and heart. He was drawn nearer. Instead of the monarch wrapped in impenetrable isolation, he became the Shechinah. No

longer the great Unapproachable, the great Unknowable, He became the Father, with a Father's love for His children. And His worship sprang not from a feeling of external obligation, but from the impulse of the Holy Spirit, that emanation of Himself which He had deposited in the finite heart. Yet, although the Shechinah was brought down to earth, its permanent residence was in the heavens. The monotheistic idea was never for a moment imperilled.⁽⁴⁾ The possibility of the offence of recognising more than one "Reshut" was never lost from view. Although God was the "place of the world" and His Presence filled the earth—ideas abounding in the Synagogue ritual and borrowed from Rabbinical literature—yet was He differentiated by a superlative sublimity from all human or terrestrial likenesses. Here we have the transcendent and immanent ideas in combination. And the vital importance of this combination to the Rabbinic or any other religion, is seen on very little consideration. For it is only through experiencing the fact of God's Immanence that we can gain the assurance of His Transcendence. The Jew's fidelity to the God of his fathers all through the medley of his historic vicissitudes is traceable to this very cause. His belief in the God of the heavens remained unshaken, only because he felt that there was a God in his earth. If it is true of all men, it is doubly true of the Jew, that

The God without he findeth not,
Who finds Him not within.

Or as Goethe has more philosophically put it :

Was wär' ein Gott, der nur von aussen stiesse,
Im Kreis das All am Finger laufen liesse !
Ihm ziemt's die Welt im Innern zu bewegen,
Natur in sich, sich in Natur zu hegen.

The Jew sought God only because he knew that God had already sought him and found him. Thus the Divine Immanence was to him, as it must be to all religionists, the starting-point of the spiritual life. But it could only become the whole of the spiritual life by combining with the Divine Transcendence.

Secondly, the Rabbinical God is intensely personal. That a transcendent God—the God of the eighteenth-century Deists—should be a person, presents no difficulty to the understanding or imagination. It is just what we expect of a God whose functions have ceased with the creation of the universe, and who for all coming time merely presides over it in an exalted and isolated unconcern. But it is not so easy to appreciate personality in a Deity who, though transcendent, is also at the same time immanent. We have already, in earlier pages, discussed what is, and what is not, implied in the attribute of personality as ascribed to God, how it differs from materiality, and how it saves religion from the pitfalls of Pantheism. The Rabbinic God was personal though not material. That the Rabbins looked at personality as something quite independent of corporeality, can be proved from a variety of passages. One noteworthy passage is that of Yalkut on Psalm xc. 1, “O Lord, a dwelling-place hast Thou been unto us in all generations.” R. Isaac said, “‘We do not know whether God is the dwelling-place of the world, or whether the world is the dwelling-place of God.’ Moses, however, came [Moses being according to the Rabbins the author of Psalm xc.] and told us, ‘O Lord, Thou art our dwelling-place’ (*i.e.* that God is the dwelling-place of the world—the world has its being in God). R. José b. Halafta said, ‘We do not know whether the world is secondary (*הַלְלוּת*) to God, or whether God is secondary to the world.’ Moses, however, came and

declared, ‘Behold there is a place with me.’ This proves that the world is secondary to God. R. Yudan said, ‘It may be likened to a strong man that rides on horseback ; his armour is suspended on both sides of the horse. The horse is secondary to the rider, the rider is not secondary to the horse.’” There are several constituent ideas in this remarkable passage. They are (1) That while God is regarded as a Personality, the object of adoration, He is yet spoken of in terms which are anything but corporeal. He is the great indefinable something in which the world lives and moves and has its being. (2) That God is an immanent Force behind all phenomena, as well as a Personality. This is the underlying sense of the metaphor about the rider and the horse : the rider is the all-directing, all-controlling power, and that power is invisible because it is from within and not from without : it is not the outer man that directs the horse, but the inward will, the spirit of the man. (3) The combination of Transcendence and Immanence in the Deity is clearly implied in the similes.

That the Rabbins resolutely set their faces against the ascription to God of any limitations of space—in spite of their assiduous attempts to demonstrate His personality, His fatherhood, etc., is seen in many other ways. Thus in Song of Songs Rabba ii. 9 it is said, “God resides between every act of praise which emanates from the mouths of Israelites, as it is said, O Thou that dwellest amidst the praises of Israel.” And further on we read, “God dwells behind the walls of synagogues and study-houses.” And again, “God looks from between the shoulders of the priests”; and again, “God is visible from between the fingers of the priests.” In all these instances we get a strong portrayal of Immanence combined with personality.

In the Mechilta בְּשָׁמוֹן (edit. Friedmann, page 38), following upon a host of varying comments on the universal appearances of the Shechinah, comes the remark that God's many-sided work for Israel is done בְּשָׁמוֹן, *i.e.* not bodily, but by His Name. Here we have the mystical usage of the Name, upon which I have said something in the earlier portion of this work. It shows clearly, how emphatic the Rabbins were in their aversion to any corporeal interpretation of the personal Deity; and how fully their minds had grasped the idea, that personality is quite independent of a tangible bodily framework. The same thing is shown in such questions as, "How could God walk in the garden of Eden? How could God walk before the Israelites in a pillar of cloud?" and several more of a like character. The answer invariably given, always aims at dissociating Divine Personality from locality, and at the same time reconciling Divine Immanence with Transcendence.

But again, if corporeality or confinement to space is not necessary to the constitution of a Divine Personality, there are certain factors which undoubtedly are necessary, nay indispensable. These are (1) consciousness, (2) intelligence, (3) purpose. Does the Rabbinic God possess these? It is not sufficient to retort that the passages just quoted, if they show anything at all, show the very things which are now demanded. They do show them, but only in part; they deal with only one fragmentary aspect of the question; they are satisfactory, only as far as Israel is concerned. Does Rabbinic literature reveal a Personal God who is conscious, intelligent, and purposive in the *universe*? This question, too, may be answered in the affirmative. The repeated references found to the Deity as the רַבִּים מְזֻרָה clearly point in this direction. In Genesis Rabba xlvi. 2 the phrase מְשֻׁבֵּת רַבִּים is interpreted by R.

Aḥa as being גלגול עינו של עולם “the ball of the world’s eye,” i.e. as he further says, עין שמשתודה מדת הדין בטלם, “the eye which performs the judgment in the universe.” God, as the eye of the universe, is an idea of telling import. The eye is the symbol for mind in all its highest and deepest manifestations. In Genesis Rabba xi. 9 God ceased from all His work (on the Sabbath), but not “from the work of the righteous and the unrighteous”; He is פועל עם אלו ועם אלו, “working both with these and with these.” Certainly an enigmatic utterance as it stands. But its drift is not hard to discover. The Rabbins here touch the profound philosophical question of evil *versus* Divine goodness. If God is immanent in man, how is sin to be accounted for? But God works “with these and with these,” i.e. He is immanent in the sinner as well as in the saint; only the sinner is he who is waging a constant warfare with the God within (as I have before sought to prove from such remarks as, “He that sins is pressing against the feet of the Shechinah,” i.e. trying to oust the immanent Divinity), whereas the saint is he, who is amenable to the voices of the ever-working Divinity that he carries within him. And this Midrashic passage is quite unsectarian. Or take again the idea in Numbers Rabba xiii. 6: “From the first day that God created His world, He desired to dwell with His creatures in the nether world.” This desire was afterward realised, continues this Midrash. Here we have all the attributes of Divine Personality, consciousness, intelligence, purpose, combined, and their arena is not Israel, but the world.

But for the most striking exemplification of all the ideas here discussed, viz. the Divine Personality, Transcendence and Immanence, purpose, consciousness, etc., all in combination, recourse must be had to the

Yalkut on Psalm cii. It is as follows: "As God fills the world, so the soul fills the body. . . . God resides in the innermost recesses, so does the soul. . . . God judges the world, so the soul judges the body. . . . The soul bears the body, so God bears the world. . . . The soul is set on high in the body, so God is on high in the world. The soul does not know its place, but God does, as it is said, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place. A certain man once asked R. Gamliel where God was. The Rabbi replied, 'I do not know.' 'Is this a specimen of your wisdom?' replied the questioner. 'You pray to God every day and do not know where His place is!' 'Ah!' replied Gamliel, 'you are asking me of something which is a journey of three thousand five hundred years' distance from here. Let me see if you could tell me the location of a certain something which you have with you by day and by night. Tell me where is your soul?' 'I do not know,' replied he. 'Well,' answered the Rabbi, 'if you do not know of that which you carry about with you at all times, how can you expect me to know of that which is a journey of three thousand five hundred years' distance hence?' 'If this be so, then,' retorted the interrogator, 'we idolaters do the right thing in worshipping the work of our hands, our idols whom we see at all moments rather than the distant God of yours.' 'No!' replied Gamliel, 'the work of your hands cannot see you; but God sees the work of His hands. . . .'" It is unnecessary, after all that has already been said, to enter into an analysis of this pregnant saying. It demonstrates the truth of the point of view for which I am here contending.

Thirdly, the Rabbinical conception of God as Shechinah and Holy Spirit, brings out an aspect of Immanence which is laden with the weightiest of lessons for the leading of the moral life generally. In the

technical analysis which has here been made, of the Shechinah and the Holy Spirit, it will be seen, on further thought, that there are *two* distinct lines of teaching. These are (1) Shechinah and Holy Spirit as an accomplished fact; (2) the Shechinah and Holy Spirit as an ideal, *i.e.* as a potentiality rather than an actuality. A truth of a most far-reaching import underlies these two separate aspects. For the critic of Immanence will inevitably ask the question, If God's presence fills all men and all things, then why seek God? Why pray? And how is sin to be accounted for? And again, conversely, Does it not seem from the very fact that prayer is so congenital an instinct of the human soul, and from the fact that even the best of men so often feel themselves forsaken of God, and continue the quest of Him by a more and more intense career of self-discipline and self-sanctification,—does it not seem as if it were untrue to say that God is

Closer to us than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet?

Now, here is a problem which, unless solved, brings down the whole structure of our arguments with a crash. But the theological treatment of the Rabbins does answer it. God is the life of all life; the world expresses His impress; He has set His Divinity, a portion of His very self, in man. But this divine endowment is, if the term may be used reverently, only the raw material. Man has to work it up, has to bring it out to perfection. If he does not do so, it remains mute, dormant, ineffective, lifeless. The seed is there, but if the soil is uncongenial and the atmosphere foetid, there can be no flower. The man of evil possesses the Divine germ, but it never reaches fruition. The worthy man is he who aims at, and succeeds in, producing the finished product. And to effect this latter, means an arduous

and persevering struggle, a ceaseless round of all-absorbing and all-embracing aspiration, an uninterrupted series of endeavours to fulfil the unfulfilled, a continuous pursuit after an ideal. That the Rabbis recognised and solved * the problem from this standpoint, is seen from the chapter on Holy Spirit as Ideal, as well as from scattered allusions in the chapters on Shechinah. It is seen from such remarks as "He that acts in such a way is worthy to behold the face of the Shechinah, or "worthy of receiving the Holy Spirit." Is this contradictory to the host of expressions emphasising the existence of the Shechinah or Holy Spirit in the midst of Israel whether individually or collectively ? By no means. These sayings merely assure us of the Divine spirit which we carry about within us. But though we possess the Spirit, we may not realise the possession ; it is there, but we may be unconscious of it ; we thwart it, wage warfare with it, quell it, unless we make the struggle and the effort to bring ourselves to terms with it. And the struggle and the effort mean the leading of the religious and moral life, the right ordering of all our faculties and powers to the end that we may be holy even as God is holy. Thus, this twofold view of the functions and nature of Holy Spirit and Shechinah renders two distinct services. (1) It emphasises the reality of sin, making its offensiveness all the greater by showing it to be a wilful quenching of the light which all men congenitally carry within them. (2) It is a welcome admonisher to men, making them at all points in life feel their unworthiness, realise their failure, and urging them to raise themselves to a loftier and purer condition of being. There is a celebrated saying in T.

* One of my learned critics here remarks : "The Rabbis solved the problem practically as all men of piety do in all religions : they did not, for they could not, solve it theoretically. The only practical solution is to live as if the problem did not exist." Very weighty words, these !

B. Yoma 39a which, somewhat enigmatically, seems to sum up the situation thus : " If man sanctifies himself a little, God sanctifies him much ; if man sanctifies himself here below, God sanctifies him above." Man carries a share of Divinity within him, but in order to realise that Divinity he must put forward his own effort. And every such effort avails. God does His part, provided man does his. The fact of God's Immanence in man raises him to ever higher stages of sanctity. It has been already shown in preceding remarks, how in the Rabbinic theology every one is a potential possessor of just that quality which marked out the prophet, viz. the Holy Spirit. We can all raise ourselves to that highest of pinnacles where we approach as near to the pattern of the Divine as our limited mortality will permit.

Fourthly, the preceding considerations lead on to the Rabbinic conclusion, that man can realise his union with God only through works. It is not belief, not meditation, not separation from the world's cares, that make perfect the imperfect fragment of the Divine which man carries about with him as man, but a life of consecrated action ; in other words, morality. Good deeds, to the simple minds of the Rabbins, imply right faith. Thus, they did not trouble themselves much about " belief " or " faith " in the technical senses of the words. They assumed them. The man who had no faith was the " Epicurus," the " Min," the Apostate, and was thus quite outside the fold, and outside the scope and application of the Rabbinic doctrines. Union with God was brought about, not by an act or a series of acts of intellectual assent, but by the striving of a lifetime. This striving consisted in obedience to a code in which morality and religion were inextricably combined. The Rabbins drew no

line of demarcation, as is nowadays done, between the spiritual or religious life and the moral life. Religion to them included morality ; and there could be no true morality unless it was at the same time religious. Out of this combination, faith was born. Or rather, faith to them, meant the practical exemplification in the everyday life, of that state of being in which the highest spirituality was interwoven with the highest morality. Thus, faith was not an act or a series of acts, but a life. It was the persistent climbing upwards to reach the ideal, the tireless endeavour to sanctify every detail of life because the Presence of God was everywhere. Faith and works were not two separate compartments whose relative merits were to be contrasted. They were one texture, indivisible, a kind of chemical compound. The man who had faith must *ipso facto* have had works. The man of good works must also possess faith. Any other alternative was unthinkable to the Rabbins.

The fact that this predominant importance of works could subsist with that far-reaching infusion of mysticism such as we have seen in the case of the Shechinah and Holy Spirit, is a sufficiently powerful refutation of Paul's criticism on Rabbinism, as it is also an equally strong solvent of the reiterated opinions on the ceremonial formalism of the Law, the outwardness of the Law, and its burdensome nature. There is a passage in the Pesikta De R. Kahana (Buber's edition 105a), where, by way of comment on Exodus xix. 3, "And Moses went up unto God," combined with Exodus xix. 20, "And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai," it is aptly remarked, that prior to the giving of the Law, heaven and earth were two totally separate things ; but once the precious boon had been vouchsafed, earth went up to heaven and heaven came down upon earth. The Law is, on this view, the first agent which made possible the Immanence

of God. Through the Law God is near, His love is realisable, communion with Him is a possibility. The Sifri on Deuteronomy xxiii. 14, "For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, etc.," summarises the whole philosophy of this Rabbinic doctrine by the quaint pictorial remark, "A man may not read the 'Shema' when standing near a pail of the washers, neither may he enter a bath nor a (בָּרוּכַּי) 'tannery' if he has books or phylacteries in his hands."⁽²⁾ Commenting on the next words in the same verse, "to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee," it remarks, "If thou doest that which is Divinely ordered in this context, the result will be that God will deliver thee and give up thine enemies before thee." It continues, "And thy camp shall be holy." "Make it holy. Hence said they, 'Man may not enter the Temple with his staff, or with his shoes, or with the dust upon his feet.' 'That He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee'; from here we learn that immoral actions cause the Shechinah to depart." The sanctifying spirit of religion attached to every detail of the everyday life. The Presence of God was everywhere to the Rabbinic Jew, and life must be lived with this unchanging consciousness. God's will must be fulfilled at every turn, and the Rabbinic Jew felt that he was fulfilling it, and that he was being inwardly illumined at every step, by a kinship and communion with the Divine. Whether in the Temple, or the Synagogue, or the home, the Rabbinic Jew was, as we see from the Sifri passage just quoted, constantly and equally impinging upon the Shechinah. Faith, to the Rabbinic Jew, was thus a compound of the whole array of theoretical beliefs which lay at the basis of his religion, together with the consecration and spiritualisation of all the relationships in life which constitute what is ordinarily

understood by morality. This conception renders Rabbinism indifferent to the antithesis drawn by Paul between faith and works. How could the mysticism embodied in the Shechinah idea hold the commanding place that it does in the Rabbinic religion, if it were true that this religion was a mere code of mechanical and formalistic legalisms, a kind of soulless deism ?

A final reflexion on the general Rabbinic conception of God must be devoted to the question whether, from the repeated and in nearly all cases exclusive, emphasis upon the Immanence of God in Israel, it is possible to detect the germ of a wider and more universalist doctrine of Divine Immanence. The critics of Rabbinism point to the emphasised nationalism of the Rabbinic religion, the small sectarian compass within which, they say, all its thoughts and teachings live and move. God only exists for Israel, and the nations outside Israel are outside God's ken, strangers to the Divine Love. This, they maintain, is the fatal defect of Talmudic theology ; and it is this which must utterly unfit and disqualify it for all time, from the possibility of becoming the foundation of a world-religion. Whereas Paul was able to rise superior to the labels and shackles of creed and nationality, and exclaim, "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek : for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon Him" (Romans x. 12), the Rabbinic Jew could only think of God in terms of His relationship to a particular nation possessing a particular form of faith. There is a very substantial justification for this complaint. The student of Rabbinic lore often comes across a beautifully-fragnant flower of thought about the loving fatherhood of God towards Israel His child ; and he feels disposed to say to himself, "Ah, how much sweeter would the flower have smelt had it had reference not to one

people but to the world!" The great majority of the illustrations I have given in regard to the mysticism implied in the Shechinah and Holy Spirit, show how strictly the Rabbinic horizon was limited to the Jew. I have already made reference to a passage in Numbers Rabba i. 3 where it is said that, had it not been for God's presence in Israel, the rain would not come down, neither would the sun shine. Here we reach the very apotheosis of particularism. God is concentrated in Israel, and Israel only; and only indirectly, only through the instrumentality and ministry of Israel, do the outside nations draw the nourishment of life from the Divine author of life. I have quoted a companion idea to the foregoing, from the Sifri בְּרַבָּד, where it is declared that God's providence in the universe generally, is only a corollary of His providence in the Holy Land.

But the fact is equally patent, that the Rabbins were by no means incapable of gleams of a wider outlook. In spite of their partiality for the idea that God shows special favouritism towards Israel, the Rabbins did not show themselves averse to the broad universalistic spirit of the Psalmist's declaration, "God is good to all" (Psalm cxlv. 9). They were able to conceive of the close affinities between the Divine and all the sons of man, and could enunciate, not only the narrower truth of the union of God with Israel, but the more comprehensive one of the union of God with all humanity. In the chapter entitled "Holy Spirit in its Relation to Non-Jews," I have given examples of Rabbinic sentiment on this head. I now proceed to supplement these with further quotations. But before doing so, a few explanatory general remarks are necessary.

The doctrine of the Immanence of God is a branch, or aspect of, mysticism. The distinctive note of mysticism

is the fact that it brings religion into the closest contact, not with authority or formulas or traditions, but with the nature of man as man. It looks upon the soul as the prime factor in religion, and it regards man's awareness of God, his intimate consciousness of the nearness of God, his innate striving after union with God, as dependent upon the soul's possibility of approaching God directly. Now, the possession of a soul is not the prerogative of the devotee of any one particular religion to the exclusion of others. All men possess souls. It follows, therefore, logically, that no religion which contains mystical elements ought to claim, on behalf of its adherents, an exclusive approach to the Divine favour, or, indeed, any superiority in the realm of the spiritual life. To assert, therefore, that Rabbinism gives a large place to mysticism, while it, at the same time, shuts itself up to a mere tribal view of God's relations to man, would be to make a contradiction in terms. The main current of feeling may have run in the direction of a confined Deity, one whose crowning concern was with one particular nation, but none the less there ran a decided under-current of thought throughout all the Rabbinic speculations, to the effect that God was exalted above all barriers of race, and that He was near to every one that calls upon Him, if only he calls upon Him in truth. It is one of the paradoxes of the Rabbinical literature, that nationalism is made to work on more or less harmonious terms with universalism. Direct heirs, as the Rabbins were, to the reiterated O.T. doctrine, that all the nations outside Israel were heathens, and that as enemies of Israel they were also the enemies of Israel's God, and therefore outside the scope of God's love, they could still accept this doctrine, and yet maintain also, higher elements of thought about the Divine impartiality

towards all men, and the Divine self-revelation to the choicest spirits of all faiths.

To come to illustration. In Genesis Rabba xxxiii. 3 there is a noteworthy comment on Psalm cxlv. 9, "The Lord is good to all; and His tender mercies are over all His works." R. Levi says that God is good unto all, and He has mercy upon all שְׁׁלָמִים מַדְ�תֵּינוּ who partake of His attributes. R. Joshua of Sirkhin, in the name of R. Levi, says, "God is good unto all, and He gives His merciful powers טָרַחֲמֵינוּ to all creatures." According to this passage, all mankind who partake of the Divine attributes, are the objects of God's special providence. This means that the exemplary characters among all races and faiths have a share in the "nearness" of God. They possess Divine elements embedded within them, are partakers of the Divine Life. The mystical colouring is very strong here. And further, the remark that "God gives His merciful powers to all creatures," shows a broad universalist conception of the Divine Immanence. It is equivalent to saying that God indwells the human being, no matter what nation he may belong to.

How free again, from all narrow sectarianism, and how all-comprehensive a doctrine of Immanence is taught by the remark, reiterated many times in the Talmud and Midrash, that God is the place of world, but the world is not His place. God is the larger life of which the world is only a part. There is a realm of reality which transcends, but at the same time comprehends, the world revealed by the senses.

And again, how free from any limitation of particularism, is the remark of Numbers Rabba xiii. 6 (already alluded to), that "From the first day of the creation of the world, God was desirous of dwelling with His creatures in the lower regions" נְחֹוחָה לְדוֹר עַם בְּרִיאוֹתָיו (

בוחתנותם). Here we sound the depths of mysticism. Humanity heaves towards God, and God responds with a counter-heaving towards humanity. It is the essence of what is implied by the Divine Love. Equally broad and universalist is the interesting string of analogies (to which I have also alluded earlier), between the soul which is both transcendent and immanent as far as the body is concerned, and the Deity who is at once transcendent and immanent in His relations to the universe and man. "Soul" here is not confined to the Israelite; neither is the universe bounded by the Jew. It is an expression of the very core and centre of the Immanent doctrine—God is the energy pervading the universe, a power operating from within, but yet, as creator, He is transcendent. Tanhuma on בראשית has the startlingly naïve statement that "From earth to heaven is as wide as an angel's hand can stretch" מלֹא פֶּסֶת יְדוֹ שֵׁל־מַלְאָך. There is little national egotism in the Rabbinic sentiment. The higher life of spiritual religion must be as inclusive as possible. And the ethical message imparted by this all-encompassing Divinity is that "man may not walk even four cubits with a proud mien (בקומה וקופת) because the whole world is filled with His glory" (T. B. Kiddushin 31a). The sin of arrogance is ignoble equally in Gentile as in Jew, because it is, in each case, an equal contradiction to the Divinity which embraces all.

I could quote more. But let these quotations suffice. They are typical. They substantiate the validity of my contention, that Rabbinic mysticism does not merely confine itself to the narrow groove of a particularistic nationalism. The Rabbins reserved the best for their own. But they by no means lacked the far-reaching and tolerant vision which distinguishes the spiritual leaders and thinkers of other races and faiths. Like them, they too believed, that there is an ineradi-

cable soul of goodness in all men whoever they be ; that above and beyond all the separating labels of the families of human-kind, there is a Higher Unity which holds all in one common grasp ; that, as a recent writer eloquently expresses it, "in the deeps of their being, all men partake of one central Divine Life." ⁽³⁾

NOTES TO CHAPTER XXII

(1) The subject of רוח רוחנין and the part it played in the Jewish gnosticism of Palestine in the last pre-Christian century is fully dealt with in M. Friedländer's work, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu* (Berlin, 1905), especially in the chapter entitled "Der Minäismus" (pp. 169-234). Dr. Friedländer collates all the Rabbinic passages dealing with רוח [which in his opinion signifies Jewish gnostic speculation about God and the world derived from the strong infiltration of Hellenic philosophy and cosmology among the Jews of the pre-Christian epoch] and shows their connexions with various Talmudic and Midrashic allusions to רוח בראשיך "מ" and רוחך "ך", also to "Metatron" and the famous passage about in T. B. Haggigah 14b.

(2) Cp. Mishna Berachoth ix. 1.

(3) Quotation from Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion*, p. xxii.

CHAPTER XXIII

RABBINIC DOCTRINES OF SIN AND EVIL FROM THE STANDPOINT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE

I HAVE already touched upon this subject lightly in the chapter on "Shechinah and Sin." But many problems were left unexplained which urgently call for explanation. It is impossible to do justice to the Rabbinic teachings in this province, without paying some regard to the general theological questions involved in the relationship between sin and an immanent God.

It has already been said, that it is far easier to give a satisfying solution of the *raison d'être* of evil in the world, on the assumption that the God of the universe is purely transcendent, than to give a comprehensible explanation of the existence of evil in a world which is indwelt by God. Hosea (chap. iv. 1-2) declares : "Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel : for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." On the deistic view of the universe, this description of society at the very climax of moral depravity, this picture of the world as the scene and playground of the most undivine agencies, can hardly be said to present any problem in

theology whatsoever. The transcendent God of Deism stands afar off from the machinery which He had Himself produced ages ago. He has no longer control over it. He is unconcerned for it. His omnipotence cannot reach it. The wickedness of the world cannot, therefore, be laid to His account, because He has no association with the world. It is the result of the moral waywardness of man. This explains everything. But from the immanent standpoint, questions of the gravest perplexity arise. If Creation is saturated with the Divine Presence, if God is eternally "near" man, and if man's heart expresses the Divine Spirit which, although it transcends man, can yet compress itself so as to find lodgment in so small a space, then the query inevitably springs to our lips, Why does God allow all this evil? The truth must lie in one of two ways. Either God permits sin and condones it; and then He cannot be the all-pure and perfect Being; or He is powerless to prevent sin; and in that case He is shorn of the attribute of omnipotence.

Here is the most delicate of all the delicate spots in Theism. It is the dilemma which puts religion upon its trial. It is the supreme criterion by which the validity of a religion, and its claim to recognition and homage, is tried. If the existence of the eternally-present, all-permeating, ever-good God cannot be reconciled with the appalling amount of sin and evil-doing wrought by mankind, then all that religion teaches about God becomes a mere worthless myth, and the foundations of all faiths are ruthlessly razed to the ground. And that the vast mass of religious apathy, apostasy, agnosticism, indifferentism, which presses with its deadly weight upon all religions to-day, is largely due to the scepticism engendered by the seeming impossibility of solving our problem, is a fact too well-

proved for any fair-minded onlooker to dispute. It would not be true to say that the enigma is only of modern growth. The Psalmist was unquestionably a mystic, and yet even he was more than once constrained to ask, in all the bitter poignancy of baffled hope and blank disappointment, why God hid His face from him when his oppressors pursued him, although guiltless and sinless.

At first sight it would seem that in the interests of open-minded truth, some surrender must be made of one at least of the claims upon which Divinity rests. These claims are omnipotence, benevolence, and immanence. But to do any such thing would be fatal; it would be giving our whole case away. A God who is not omnipotent, or who is not benevolent or not immanent, would be unworthy of worship. We must then direct ourselves to the question, in what other way or ways is a solution of the difficulty obtainable by theists; and—more specifically—how does Rabbinic theology envisage the problem, how does it vindicate a just and loving God, a Shechinah, a Holy Spirit, in the face of the rampant sin of man and the perversity of the world?

It is the fashion of some theologies, ancient as well as modern, to offer a solution of the problem by the introduction of some kind of angelology or demonology. The evil that man does, is the result of the prompting of some almost semi-divine principle or power of evil. This power of evil is a kind of Demiurge, a delegated agent of God, whose special province it was, from the very beginning of creation, to implant the evil impulse in man. Thus, when man sins, it is in consequence, as it were, of his being under the unlucky influence of this personified Power of Evil, who although a messenger of God, and accordingly commissioned to do His will, yet somehow or other has the effect of bringing man into

a state of impurity, and thus shut out from the presence of God. Sin and Divinity are, on such theories, reconciled by saying that sin is the handiwork not of God but of His delegate. Both Philo and the Rabbinical literature exemplify a great deal of this kind of reasoning. One great plank in the platform of Philo's theology is his reiterated assumption that matter is an evil. And it becomes apparent, to even the superficial student of his cosmology, that while trying to adhere as faithfully as he can, to the literality of the Genesis narrative, he is at the greatest pains to couch his description of the creation of the world, in terms that would imply that the Deity rather "formed" the world (in the Platonic sense) than "created" it, because "creating" must necessarily bring the Deity into contact with that which is impure and of the nature of sin, viz. matter. But, in those parts of his writings where cosmology is not his subject—and when he has to give countenance to the great question of the relation of human sin to Divine goodness—Philo's ingenuity invented another device for surmounting the difficulty. He introduced his theories about the "Logoi." The Logoi do not always mean the same thing in Philo. But what is *noteworthy* and to the purpose is, the undoubted fact, that *angels* are a branch of the Logoi. "Those beings whom other philosophers call demons, Moses usually calls angels; and they are souls hovering in the air."⁽¹⁾ Angels, souls, and demons are things differing indeed in name, but one and identical in reality. These souls or angels "the creator has been accustomed to employ as handmaidens and servants in the administration of mortal affairs." As God is good, so all angels or souls are originally all good. What creates bad angels is the badness of the persons with whom they become associated, "those other men who have disregarded

wisdom, giving themselves up to the pursuit of unstable things regulated by fortune alone, not one of which is referred to the most excellent portion of ourselves, the soul or the mind ; but all rather to the dead corpse connected with us, that is to the body or the things which are even more lifeless than that, such as glory and money and offices and honours and all other things, which, by those who do not keep their eyes fixed on what is really beautiful, are fashioned and endowed with apparent vitality by the deceit of vain opinion.”⁽²⁾ Philo pushes his contention of the aloofness of the Deity from all possible contact with evil, by assuming that the bad angels are the result of the perversity of man, and are no part of God’s creation. But the flaw in his reasoning, is easily discernible. Granted that the bad angel has only become so, because of his being conjoined with the man who is worldly and material, Philo has not answered the question, Who made such a man worldly and material? In other words, sin is unaccounted for, and the original problem remains as unsolved as before.

Rabbinic theology largely delegates sin to the work of certain classes of angels, with the object of bridging the chasm between the sinfulness of man and the goodness of God. This delegation is mainly seen in the several personifications of the “Yetser Ha-Ra.” In T. B. Baba Bathra 16a an identity is established between Yetser Ha-Ra, Satan, and the Angel of Death. What is the business of any one of this group? It is יורד ומחרה ונוטל נטמה ושולח “It comes down and misleads men [to sin], then it goes up again [to heaven] and receives sanction to slay the soul.” In T. B. Berachoth 16b the personification of the Yetser Ha-Ra is unquestioned, seeing that Rab (Abba Arika) in his prayer puts it on the same footing

with "the evil man, the evil companion, and Satan." In all those passages where the Rabbins attributed personality to the Yetser Ha-Ra (and of course there are several where they did not personify, and where it is merely another word for sin), it was done with the motive of ascribing the authorship of sin and impurity to some principle or power, which, although delegated by God, was yet other than He.*

But these Rabbinic attempts at the solution of the problem fall quite as flat as Philo's. Argue as strongly as you like, that sin is the handiwork of some evil angel or rebellious semi-divine Principle, you do not yet succeed in exonerating the Deity from participation in its cause. God is the creator of the angel, and as such He must have willed that the angel should behave in this particular way, and He must have known the results that would supervene. The Rabbins themselves could not have imagined that they had, by any theory of delegation, discovered the solution of the problem, because in spite of their reiterated attribution of Personality to the Yetser Ha-Ra, they yet regarded the latter as merely a passive tool in the power of the Deity. One of the most emphatic examples of their subordination of the Yetser to God is found in T. B. Sukkah 52a, where God is spoken of as one day exterminating (lit. = slaughtering *תְּבִרֵבָה*) the Yetser Ha-Ra in the presence of saints and sinners.

We are, then, constrained to turn to quite another method of reasoning for the reconciliation of the facts of sin, with the theory of an immanent God. A recent writer has presented the case very forcibly thus: "What I have to say, leads back, through

* All these points are ably discussed from the Rabbinic standpoint in F. C. Porter's essay on "The Yeṣer Ha-Ra" (*Yale Biblical and Semitic Studies*, New York, 1901). I regret that in writing on this subject, I did not have the opportunity of consulting this lucid and accurate piece of work.

Hegelianism, to the old Greek thinkers, and beyond them again, to the wise men who lived and taught in the East, ages before Jesus was born. It is that this finite universe of ours, is one means to the self-realisation of the infinite. Supposing God to be the infinite consciousness, there are still possibilities to that consciousness which it can only know as it becomes limited. . . . To all eternity, God is what He is, and never can be other ; but it will take Him to all eternity to live out all that He is. In order to manifest even to Himself the possibilities of His being, God must limit that being. There is no other way in which the fullest self-realisation can be attained. Thus we get two modes of God — the infinite, perfect, inconditioned, primordial being ; and the finite, imperfect, conditioned and limited being of which we are ourselves expressions. And yet these two are one, and the former is the guarantee that the latter shall not fail in the purpose for which it became limited. Thus to the question, Why a finite universe ? I should answer, Because God wants to express what He is. His achievement here is only one of an infinite number of possibilities.

God is the perfect poet,
Who in creation acts His own conceptions.
This is an end worthy alike of God and man.”⁽⁸⁾

To put the argument in simpler phraseology, What the writer really means is this—God is only infinite and omnipotent when considered in the abstract, *i.e.* as a kind of absolute apart from the world. But when considered in His relations to the universe and man, He is limited and is not omnipotent. His omnipotence, paradoxical as it may sound, is limited. The creation of man involves a necessary limitation of Divine Power, because in creating man, God has delegated to him a certain fragment of Himself, a certain portion of His

omnipotence. In this way man "expresses" God. But he is not identical with God. That part of God, with which as the result of the Divine self-limitation he is endowed, may be used by him either for, or against, God. Man's will is the Divine element in man, but it may set itself in opposition to its Divine source! Out of the "infinite number of possibilities" which may arise through this Divine self-implanting in man, that which frequently happens is the wilful and wicked rebellion of man against God. Man grieves and vexes the Holy Spirit within him. But the question may pertinently be asked, If God in order to express Himself took such an extreme step, as it were, of limiting His omnipotence, why did He not prearrange it in such a way that there should be no possibility of man opposing Him, why did He not withhold the evil element entirely, and make man a pattern of all-goodness, even as He Himself is all-good? The answer seems to be that man is given by God, the choice between alternatives of action. The good and the evil are set before him, and he has the unfettered freedom to accept either. It is only this freedom of choice that makes virtue possible. It is only this power of individual initiative that makes man a moral agent. As a recent writer expresses it: "Moral good consists in *right choosing*. It is *right choosing* that makes what we call character. . . . *Right choosing*: but if there is to be choosing there must be two courses to choose between. If God had made me so that I could not tell a lie, I could not choose to tell the truth. I should tell the truth automatically, as I breathe and sneeze and cough. But that would not make character. It would not be moral good. . . . And as, if His object with men is to get moral good out of them, to make character, God is obliged to leave the lie open to me as well as

the truth, so also, throughout all the range of morals, He is in like manner compelled, omnipotent though He be, if He would have moral good evolved . . . to leave open to them the wrong as well as the right, the disobedience as well as the obedience, the sin as well as the virtue. And so, if moral good, character, righteousness, be the supreme purpose of God with man, then even omnipotence had to leave open the door to sin, the greatest of the evils.”⁽⁴⁾

And the outcome of this freedom of choice, of this Divine evolution of man as a moral agent, is the great fact of responsibility. If man has before him the two paths, and he wilfully exercises his choice in favour of the wrong path, then the responsibility is his, not God’s ; the blame for the sin rests upon his shoulders, not upon the shoulders of God. Had God not given us the freedom to choose between the two alternatives of righteousness and sin, then morality would have been impossible. But He wants us to be moral, He wants us to struggle with and finally conquer our baser yearnings, He wants us to raise ourselves on the “stepping-stones of our dead selves to higher things,” He wants us to draw near to His service and be holy even as He is holy.⁽⁵⁾ He has endowed us with the power to act this high part. He has handed us the key for opening our hearts to this noble choice, by having breathed into us a portion of His Holy Spirit, and by having encompassed us with the halo of His never-absent Shechinah. When we sin, we are traitors to all these immanent Divine promptings. We are kicking against these implanted Divine traces, trying to obliterate them, oust them ; and the responsibility for the sin is ours, not God’s.

It is in some such way as this, that the current theology of to-day attempts the reconciliation between sin and the Immanence of God. And, coming now to

my main point—it is the way of Rabbinic theology. Let me attempt to explain the matter more clearly. In T. B. Berachoth 33b it is remarked : “ R. Hanina said everything is in the power of Heaven save the fear of Heaven.” God’s omnipotence is limited by man’s piety and impiety. These are outside the purview of the Divine omnipotence and dependent solely upon the will of man. In T. B. Sabbath 104a it is said : “ R. Simeon b. Lakish asked what is the meaning of the verse ‘ Surely He scorneth the scorners ; but He giveth grace unto the lowly ’ (Proverbs iii. 34) ? ” “ It means that he who wishes to lead an unclean life has the door open to him, i.e. he is not opposed nor is he helped (see Rashi on passage *חוֹא יְלִיצָה מַעֲצָמָה וְלֹא יְמַנְעָה יְסֻעִידָה*) ; but he who wishes to lead a pure life is helped Divinely (Rashi *יְסֻעִידָה טָן הַשְׁמִים*). ” Sin is here portrayed as entirely in man’s hand, outside the reach of omnipotence. Man has the freedom of choice, and there is no Divine interference.⁽⁶⁾ The *locus classicus* for this “ freedom-of-choice ” teaching is the well-known Mishna Aboth iii. 15, “ Everything has been foreseen by God, yet freedom of will has been given.” The Rabbins firmly believed that there would have been no meaning and no virtue in morality, without this freedom of choice. The Talmud contains the striking saying *כָל הַגָּדוֹל מִחְבָּרו יִצְרָא גַּדוֹל דִּינָנוּ*, “ the greater the man is, the stronger is his impulse to sin.”⁽⁷⁾ Not alone is sin here regarded as the dragging-down tendency in all men, but it is actually one of the marks by which a greater man is distinguished from a lesser, and it is a feature of the constitution of even the greatest among men. There are two different strains of thought in Rabbinic literature which go to prove their theory that morality is only made possible through the possibility of man exercising freedom of choice, in a conflict between good and

evil motives. They are (1) statements on the Yetser Tob and Yetser Ha-Ra, of which the following are representative. Genesis Rabba ix. 7: "R. Nahman, son of Samuel son of Nahman, in the name of R. Samuel son of Nahman, said, The words חנה טוב מאריך, 'Behold it was very good' (*i.e.* were it so written in Genesis i. 31) would refer to the good impulse, but the words וזנה טוב מאריך, 'And behold it was very good' (as it is actually in Genesis i. 31) refer to the evil impulse. Can then the evil impulse be truly said to be very good? This is a question! The answer is Yes! for were it not for the evil impulse, man would not build a house, neither would he get married, nor would he beget children, nor would he follow any vocation in life. . . .*

R. Huna said, The words 'Behold it was very good' (*i.e.* as before—were it written so in Genesis i. 31) refer to God's attribute of goodness, but the words 'And behold it was very good,' refer to God's attribute of punishment. Can then the attribute of punishment be designated good? The answer is Yes! it is only through it that men come to merit eternal life." The implication of this paradoxical Midrash is this: Man has an innate freedom of choice between the good and the bad; it is this fact that makes him a moral being. But so necessary and indispensable is it for man's morality, that he should put forth the effort involved in making this choice between the alternatives, that even if, in some respects, he chooses the wrong alternative, the net result is not necessarily sin, for even an occasional giving way to the Yetser Ha-Ra subserves a high moral and religious purpose. But it is the struggle

* Yalkut on Psalm xxxvii. elaborates this idea. It is not the "Yetser Ha-Ra" but "Kinnah" (*רִזְעָה*) that plays these parts. "Kinnah"=jealousy. "Were it not for the existence of the sin of jealousy, the world would be defunct. No man would plant a vineyard, nor would he build a house, nor would he marry." It was Abram's jealousy of Melchizedec's philanthropy that caused Abram's greatness.

involved in the choice that is the criterion.* Of course, it must be remembered, in this connexion, that according to the theology of the Rabbins, such acts as "building a house," getting married, and begetting children are not merely, as we nowadays regard them, part and parcel of everyday morality, but facts of religion, aspects of the religiously-led life answering the demands of Heaven because they are ordained by Heaven. The second part of the Midrash, justifying the doctrine about a punitive God by reason of its being the only means of causing man "to merit eternal life," is a pictorial way of stating the great theological truth, that pain is not a sign of Divine vindictiveness, but a discipline at the hands of a merciful God. The sufferings of man are no contradiction to the Divine all-goodness. They are portion of the larger plan of a God, who, out of the very fact of His all-goodness, wants that man may be the better induced to see wherein his own soul's welfare resides, and thus ascend higher and higher in the scale of religious and moral worth.⁽⁸⁾

A more paradoxical form of this teaching is found in a passage in Mishna Berachoth ix. (see also Sifri on ברכות, edit. Friedmann, p. 73), "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, i.e. בשניך, with thy two impulses, viz. the Yetser Tob and the Yetser Ra."† The serving of God can only come to man, as the outcome of the Yetser Tob's victory over the Yetser Ra. It is in man's power to effect this victory, by means of his making *the correct choice* between the alternatives. But while under the dominion

* This subject is admirably treated in a sermon by Mr. Israel Abrahams, on pp. 102 *et seq.* of *Aspects of Judaism* (Macmillan, 1895). Mr. Abrahams quotes, with telling effect, the passage in T. B. Berachoth 5a, "Ever let a man excite (רָא) his good yetser against his bad yetser."

† The reading here is not "Ha-Ra" but merely "Ra." Curiously enough, the definite article ("Ha") is usually affixed to the "Ra," and usually omitted from the "Tob."

of his bad impulse, man is not necessarily cut off from exercising his choice to serve God. Even the Yetser Ra need not necessarily extinguish what ought to be man's aspiring struggle to the possession of the highest virtue. The evil is there, only that man may mount, by means of it, to higher and better things.

(2) The Rabbinic teachings on Repentance delineate the highest morality and religion as the fruits of a rightful choice between two conflicting alternatives. "Great," said one Rabbi, "is the efficacy of repentance, for not even the most perfectly pious saint can stand in the place where the repentant sinner stands."⁽⁹⁾ The basic thought underlying such a maxim is this: The perfect saint is the man who has never experienced the temptations of sin. He has never had to battle within himself, as to which of the two conflicting courses to take. Piety, rectitude, morality, religion have all come to him naturally, as it were. They are not the result of his soul's warfare with the baser elements in his constitution, leading to a choice of the better alternative. But the repentant sinner has been in the thick of the battle and has emerged victorious. He has exercised his God-given faculty of *freedom of choice*. He has chosen virtue. He has repented. The crux of repentance lies in this exercise of choice.

But on further reflexion is not the perfect saint who has never known sin a mere abstraction? Do we ever, except in the figments of our imagination, meet with any one who has never experienced the conflict between the motives of good and evil, and who has never had occasion to hear the strains of that indefinable inner voice which says Choose? The Rabbins were fully alive to the fact, that such a person was an abstraction, an ideal figure. No man can be

sinless. Therefore every man needs repentance. Hence repentance is one of the corner-stones of Rabbinic theology. It is the starting-point of all the virtues, as the Rabbins understood them. It is the seed out of which religious worth and moral goodness grow. Without it, righteousness would be unthinkable, and the barrier between man and God insuperable. This teaching is illustrated over and over again in the realms of Talmud and Midrashim. Repentance is a feature in the work of all the world's best men; it is repentance, more than anything else, that has been the prime fashioning and controlling influence. In T. B. Pesahim 54a (cp. T. B. Nedarim 39b), it is one of seven things created by God previous to the world's creation. "Repentance reaches to the throne of God." "Repentance brings healing to the world." "Repentance brings nigh the redemption." These and many other similar sayings in T. B. Yoma 86a, all point to the fundamental efficacy of repentance in the religious and moral life of men. Perhaps the most remarkable is the saying in Song of Songs Rabba vii. 5, "The King Messiah is called Hadarach⁽¹⁰⁾ (בָּאֵץ חֲדוֹרֶךְ in Zechariah ix. 1) because he will lead all men in repentance before God" (גַּבְעָתָה לִפְנֵי הַקָּבָ"ה . . . בְּחַשְׁבוֹה לְהַדּוֹרֶךְ). The realisation of the Messianic coming was the acme of spiritual hope to the Rabbis and their people. I have already mentioned in a former portion of this treatise, the potent mysticism which, in Rabbinical literature, frequently attaches to names, particularly the Divine name and the name of the Messiah. That a Rabbi should actually derive the name of the Messiah from his appointed mission as the great leader of men to repentance, is a convincing demonstration of the Rabbinic belief in the basic power of repentance in the religious and moral life of mankind.⁽¹¹⁾

To sum up the argument in a few words. In granting us freedom God has placed a fateful power in our hands. He has opened the door to sin and all the other evils that flesh is heir to. But God had inevitably to act thus. It is the only means by which man could take his true place as a moral and spiritual being. It is the supreme testimony to the benevolence of God, whose purpose it is that man should, by his striving, by his failures, and his pains, find out for himself the correct path which leads to his physical, as well as spiritual, contentment.

And there is no contradiction between these facts as they are, and the fact of an indwelling, immanent God! God abides among men. The technical term by which this abiding is expressed, is Shechinah or Holy Spirit. When men sin, they are *ipso facto* refusing to listen to the inner voice of the abiding Shechinah which urges them to choose the right and not the wrong alternative. Sin is the stubborn resistance to that voice. In the graphic language of the Midrash, the Shechinah (and the same might be said of Holy Spirit) is ousted by sin. Good men, however, are they who act in consonance with the voice of the immanent God. Their characters have been formed, refined, by the very fact of their having been set down in a world where sin abounds, and by the fact that they have chosen the right alternative. They bring the Shechinah back to earth again, in the sense that they exactly express the Godhead within them, and their example is the incitement to an ever-increasing endeavour to make mankind the focus, the receptacle of divinity. They are, to use the technical expression, נָשָׂר שָׂרֶת פָּלַח בְּקָבָ"ה, "Co-partners with God."

NOTES TO CHAPTER XXIII

(1) Philo, *De Gigantibus*, II.

(2) Another important aspect of angels in Philo is, of course, their intercessory powers between man and God. In this respect, also, their functions seem largely to coincide with that of the Logos. This is a by no means easy branch of Philonic thought to understand.

(3) Rev. R. J. Campbell, *The New Theology*, pp. 22-23.

(4) R. A. Armstrong, *God and the Soul*, pp. 129, 130.

(5) Cp. lines of Browning :—

I can believe this dread machinery
 Of Sin and sorrow (would confound me else)
 Devised . . . to evolve
 By new machinery in counterpart,
 The moral qualities in man—how else ?
 To make him love and be beloved,
 Creative and self-sacrificing too,
 And this eventually god-like.

Quoted in R. E. Welsh, *In Relief of Doubt*, p. 107.

(6) The Rabbins never really entered into the difficult problem of reconciling their repeated statements on the Divine prescience with their doctrines of the Freedom of the Will. They stated both emphatically but only spasmodically. They never faced the perplexities that must arise from the double assumption. That Rabbinic theology is, on the whole, a strong foe of Determinism is seen more particularly from its teachings on Repentance. "Even before the world was created, Repentance was called into being" (T. B. Pesahim 54a). This implies that the very first act of creation was that of enabling man to change his attitude towards God, for the better, *i.e.* freedom to use his will for the better cause, with the implication of course that he had equal freedom to refuse the call. Some of the modern determinist ethicists make a great fuss about heredity as being the great bugbear to the acceptance of freewill. There is much to be said for their view. The Rabbins never touched this difficulty. God, said they, visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children only "when the children follow the bad example of their parents." It did not seem to occur to them that the children might possibly be dragged to do so involuntarily as an effect of physical heredity.

The mediæval Jewish philosophers, however, like Saadiah, Jehuda Ha-Levi, Maimonides, Hisdai Crescas, Joseph Albo and others faced these metaphysical problems thoroughly, each one in his own way. Maimonides deals with it in the *Morah*, iii. 20, as well as in the concluding chapter of his *Eight Chapters*. His conclusion is merely the confession of human ignorance in face of the Divine secrets. Thus he says: "To him therefore who finds his argument in favour of predestination on the omniscience and prescience of the Deity, we reply, These His attributes and the manner in which they are exercised, are as incomprehensible to thee as they are to us or to any other human being; and Holy Writ checks our impertinent inquisitiveness on these subjects

by admonishing us, ‘Can thy researches define God? Canst thou penetrate the purpose of the Almighty?’ (Job xi. 7).” (Translation from *Hebrew Review*, vol. i. p. 369. A free and none too accurate translation, but it expresses the ideas of the original.)

(7) In T. B. *Sukkah* 52a.

(8) Cp. T. B. *Berachoth* 5a the remark: “Pains purge the iniquities of man.”

(9) Cp. T. B. *Berachoth* 34b the remark: “What the prophets prophesied referred only to the repentant sinners, but no eye hath yet seen the perfect saint.” The latter is a fiction.

(10) The connexion between בְּרִירָה and בְּרִירָה is explained by saying that the guttural letters בְּרִירָה interchange. The student of Rabbinics often comes across such methods of interpretations. The Commentary טהרה וטהרה has a long disquisition on this passage in Song of Songs Rabba.

(11) For further references see the remarkably lucid monograph on Repentance by Mr. C. G. Montefiore in *J.Q.R.* xvi. 209-257. There are also several noteworthy quotations in Weber’s *Jüdische Theologie*, but one has to take them with caution by reason of Weber’s dominant desire to strip Rabbinism of spirituality and make it a religion of the outward only.

CHAPTER XXIV

ABBINIC VIEWS OF PRAYER FROM THE STANDPOINT OF DIVINE IMMANENCE

I HAVE had occasion many times to point out, that in Rabbinic religion, Transcendence and Immanence are one combined aspect of the Deity. Deism is abhorrent to Rabbinism because it lays all its emphasis on the transcendent factor. Pantheism errs in the other extreme. Resting itself as it does, upon the elusive doctrine of Immanence, it leaves no room for a personal God, and it maintains (or runs close to maintaining) an identity between God and the world, which, for all practical purposes, amounts to a total annihilation of religion. Is such an idea as prayer possible to a Deist? In giving the answer one would have to distinguish between the fact of praying, and the expectation of an answer to the prayer. As for the latter, it is hard to see how it could fall within the programme of the Deist. God has finished His work in the world, and views its happenings with a far-off disinterest. How can He intervene in the interests of His creatures, seeing that these interests hold no longer a place in His mind? But, yet, the *fact of prayer* to a Deist is quite logically possible. An overwhelming emotion of the moment might be the cause of some broken heart pouring out its anguish, so that He might possibly hear it, although when the emotion has subsided,

the suppliant would realise the impossible nature of his act. But the fact might happen. Moreover, prayer includes a good deal besides petition. It means the adoration of God, it means the act of self-abasement at the thought of the invincible holiness of God. And the Deist might very well give expression to these feelings. But to the Pantheist, prayer is not only impossible, but its very act would involve a self-contradiction. If God does not transcend the universe, then He is nothing more than the universe; and as we are part of the universe and partially identical with it, then we are part of God and partially identical with Him. Accordingly it follows, that in praying to God we are but praying to what is another name for ourselves. It would be an act of self-worship; and the act of communion between ourselves and a Person greater than ourselves—the chief constituent of prayer and the corner-stone of every known religious system—is totally absent. Then, again, from another standpoint, a basic psychological factor in prayer is that movement of the mind which culminates in aspiration. To pray is to aspire, to aim at reaching something which one has not yet reached. One of the favourite Biblical phrases for prayer is that of “stretching out the hands,” and this is expressive of the physical concomitants of the emotion of aspiration. The hands are thrust forward as if to grasp something which, though distant, is yet attainable. Prayer thus involves always an element of futurity. But the Pantheist, by the very tenets of his creed, ignores or denies these factors of aspiration or futurity. If God is so merged in the universe that the most precious part of man, his soul, is an integral constituent of God, then what need has man’s soul for the exercise of prayer? What need has it to aspire? What quest has it to make? If it

already possesses God, then it has no need to set out trying to get possession of Him. It has already reached its goal before starting. Prayer can have no bettering effects upon him who offers it, seeing that God is, at the outset, as near the man who prays as He can be and as He ever will be. To pray is to expect a condition of things different from what one has at the moment. But if this condition of things is realised from the first, then prayer is superfluous and impossible.

Thus prayer, in the highest and best sense, presupposes a Deity who is at once transcendent and immanent. The Rabbinic religion, as I have already had occasion to state, several times, conceives of God ever under these two aspects in strict combination. I hope to show shortly how their doctrines about prayer are framed on this assumption.

In modern times, one of the strongest barriers to the belief in the utility of prayer is its supposed collision with the established scientific truth of the uniformity of Nature. Prayer, it is said, is based on the unscientific idea that there is something haphazard or arbitrary in the ways of Nature. Rain is brought about by certain atmospheric laws. Good health is the result of obedience to sanitary laws. Death is determined by physiological laws. Now, suppose some one prays to God, asking His intervention in any of these, so that by His instrumentality something should, or should not, happen in these spheres, which by the very fundamental nature of these laws *must* or *must not* happen, as the case may be, is it not totally absurd to think—so it is often nowadays argued—that the indisputable reign of law can be arrested by the caprice of an *omnipotent* will? Modern theologians, of course, have their answer. What are the answers of Rabbinic theology to this difficulty?

According to the Rabbins, petition is only a part of prayer. Prayer has always suffered from being wrongly interpreted as a synonym for making requests. It comprises ever so much more. There is a pregnant saying on this head, in Deuteronomy Rabba ii. 1 as follows : א"ר יוחנן טשרה לשוניות בקראות תפללה ואלו הן (1) שועה א"ר יוחנן טשרה לשוניות בקראות תפללה ואלו הן (1) שועה צעקה (7), ביצור (6), נאקה (5), רנה (4), פגיעה (3), קריאה (2), נפלל (9), נפל (8). R. Johanan said there are ten synonyms for prayer : (1) and (2) cry (based on Exodus ii. 23b, "And the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried (וַיִצְעַקּוּ); and their cry (שׁוֹתָחֶם) came up unto God . . ."); (3) groaning (based on Exodus ii. 24, "And God heard their groaning"); (4) and (5) cry and intercession (based on Jeremiah vii. 16b, "neither lift up a cry (רִנָה) for them, neither make intercession" (חֲפֹגָה) to me); (6) and (7) distress and calling (based on Psalm xviii. 6, "In my distress (בָצָר) I called (אָקָרָא) upon the Lord"); (8) "falling down" (based on Deut. ix. 18, "And I fell down before the Lord"); (9) "executing judgment" (based on Psalm cvi. 30, "Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgment" (וַיִּטְלֹל));⁽¹⁾ (10) "beseeching" (based on Deut. iii. 23, "And I besought (וְאָתַחֲנוּ) the Lord, at that time, saying").⁽²⁾

Out of all these ten it is only the tenth (ההנוניות) that belongs to the domain of pure request. Numbers (1) (2) (3) merely refer to the simple act of communion, the unloading of one's cares before God and the conveying of them into His ear; (4) and (8) are the act of adoration, the word, רנה, although translated "cry" in the A.V., literally = song, or song of praise; (5) refers to mediation; (6) and (7) are of the nature of aspiration; (9) to righteous and just dealing. This view is summarily put in a passage preceding the Midrash just quoted, where we are told :

"I might have thought that man need only ask his wants and that would suffice, but Solomon has already made it clear in the words, 'To hearken unto the cry and unto the prayer' (1 Kings viii. 28). Cry refers to the adoration of God, prayer denotes the petition for one's wants." Here "crying" and "praying" are really meant to be the two constituent elements of prayer. But it is noteworthy that not only does the adoration element constitute half of prayer, but it also takes precedence of the element of petition.

The point here is this : Petition, according to Rabbinic ways of thinking, is only one department of prayer, and not by any means the most important department. Prayer is the spiritual action of the soul turned towards God as its true and adequate object. It is a spiritual intercourse with God. To utter requests, to tabulate petitions, to compose prayerful words and songs is one thing ; but to pray is to come into vital communion with God. It is to have God by one's side : on one's right hand, as the Scripture terms it ; it is to enter into an actual fellowship with a Divine Companion ; it is to experience the Presence of One with whom "eternal strength and wisdom are." And, as a consequence, the emotion that one experiences in prayer, is that of the inrushing of a new life. A great refreshing comes over mind and body, all sorts of potentialities and possibilities are let loose so that the soul feels that it has a new lease of vigour and energy, and the question whether the prayer is objectively answered or not becomes of quite secondary consequence. Prayer becomes its own answer, its own reward. The assurance of the nearness of God swamps all other considerations. Prayer is the end as well as the means.*

* In T. B. Berachoth 32b there is a passage in the name of R. Hanina recommending lengthy prayers (*ברך רחמים ברכות מאריך בחפלה ונין*). Another passage is there quoted in the name of R. Johanan deprecating lengthy prayers

Among the mediæval theologians, Bahya has voiced the mystical view of prayer in the following words : "It is meet, my brother, that thou shouldst know that our object in prayer is but the consummation of the soul's longing for God and its humiliation before Him, coupled with its expressed exaltation of the Deity, its bestowal of praise and gratitude upon His name, and its casting of all its burdens upon Him." Fixed forms of prayer were only invented, according to Bahya, in order to guide the soul in its behaviour before its Maker, because it is not given to every one to express his feelings in words which would be seemly to the King of Kings. And when language fails, thought also fails ; the only incentive to thought is the ability to express thought. This, by the way, is an accepted modern psychological truth. Therefore, says Bahya, man's communion with God customarily runs along the lines of stereotyped formulæ of prayer. But *this need not be so.*⁽³⁾ Prayer can be an affair of the heart, without any words at all, "זהבנן אינו צריך זרך אל הדברו ונכ'"⁽⁴⁾ "The subject of the prayer requires no words in such a case where it is possible to compose it entirely in the heart. The latter comprises the essence of our communion, and is the stay upon which our object in prayer must rest." In support of this statement, Bahya quotes the Rabbinical ordinance : *בעת חרתק בעל קרי מהרהור בלבו ונכ'* "In the time of emergency, he who is ritually unclean may meditate his prayer in his heart, and need not say the necessary benedictions, neither before nor after it." "Prayer," says Bahya in the same chapter, "is a sign of God's good faith in thee and a pledge of His ; for He has given its context into thy hand and placed it in thy power." In this view, prayer is the movement of God to man rather than the reverse. And this of course is perfectly correct. For prayer is ultimately based on love, and "no soul can possibly know that it loves God and not at once infer that God loved it first ; . . . if therefore we, imperfect and puny,

as leading to disappointment (טומא באה ליר נאכ לב). The difficulty is got over by saying that it all depends upon whether the suppliant is בהין זען. This, according to Rashi, means that "he who prays looks anxiously forward to the fulfilment of his request by reason of the lengthiness of his prayer." We seem to have here a good instance of the *mystical* as opposed to the *petitioning* side of Rabbinic prayer. Make a long prayer if you like, but don't do so because you think you will gain something thereby ! See also T. B. Berachoth 55a.

in truth love Him who is unseen and dimly known, how much more does He, who cannot overlook us, assuredly love us, not indeed because we deserve it, but because it is part of His own nature's perfection?"⁽⁵⁾ It follows from all Bahya's arguments on this head, that the groundwork of prayer is the *felt inner necessity* to pray. We pray, in the last resort, because we feel that we ought to pray. It is not petition but communion. It is not begging but thanksgiving. We want to mingle our spirit with His, and prayer is the only instrument for doing this. The very act of prayer gives us the assurance that if we have any needs or requests to be fulfilled, they will be fulfilled quite apart from the asking. The very adoration of the Being who vouchsafes His loving companionship to us at all times when we need Him, begets in us the consciousness that He knows our burdens even without our uttering them. And this adoration is prayer.

Let us now see how these ideas are reflected in the Rabbinical teachings. In T. B. Ta'anith 2a it is said, "איזו דיא שבורה שבלבינו," "What service is heart-service? Prayer." If prayer is a heart-service, it cannot be other than a seeking after God for what He is, and not for what He gives. It is a panting, not for gifts, but for the consciousness of the God-presence. In T. B. Berachoth 30b, R. Eliezer says: *לעולם ימוד אדם את עצמו וננו*. "A man should take an estimate of himself (previous to praying). If he finds that he will be able to feel a real heart-devotion (*לכזון*), then he may pray. If he finds that he cannot, then he must not pray." For want of a better word in English, the word *לכזון*, or its noun *כוונה* are invariably rendered "devotion." It is only in the mysticism of the mediæval Kabbalah, that justice is done to the real drift of the word "Kavanah." This can be seen by a glance at those Prayer-Books which contain, either in marginal notes, or in the body of the text, the פִּי חָאָרֵי נוֹגָנוֹת עַל, "meditations according to the view of R. Isaac Luria of blessed memory." The true

“Kavanah” means the abandonment, for the time being, of all mundane thoughts and of all physical necessities, in the unalloyed consciousness of a union with God. What often passes now for “Kavanah” is only a faint and oftentimes a spurious imitation of the real thing. What the Rabbins actually intended when they laid it down, as in T. B. Berachoth 13a, b, that מצית צריכות נזינה, or when R. Simeon, voicing their view, remarked (Aboth ii. 18), “And when thou prayest do not make thy prayer a fixed task” (*קבץ*), was a mystical communion in which the soul bows down in adoration before its Maker, without any necessary thought of eliciting a favour.⁽⁶⁾ And it is some such interpretation that best suits the recurring Rabbinical saying about the reading of the “Shema” being “a receiving upon oneself of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven.” The reading of the “Shema” and the reading of *תפילה* (Prayer), stand on very much the same level in the Rabbinical codes. The prescriptions hedging round each, are largely identical. Hence, it is no undue deduction to say, that prayer in their opinion is a “receiving upon oneself of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven”*—a mystical expression for the closest possible spiritual contact with God.⁽⁷⁾

Other illustrations of the preceding views are the following: In T. B. Berachoth 29b, R. Eliezer permits a brief prayer (in place of the statutory Eighteen Benedictions) in the case of one who is in fear of attack from brigands. And the prayer he suggests is this: “Do Thy will in heaven above, and give contentment of spirit to those who fear Thee beneath, and do that which is good in Thine eyes. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.” There is simple communion here without the least notion of material gifts. In T. B. Berachoth 34b we

* In a passage in T. B. Berachoth 10b, prayer is actually so called.

read : "It was said concerning R. Hanina b. Dosa, that when he used to pray on behalf of the sick, he used to say, 'This one will recover and live, but that one will die.' When they said to him, 'How do you know this ?' he used to reply, 'If my prayer is fluent upon my lips then I know that it is accepted, but if it is not fluent, then I know that it is rejected.'" This is one of the most cogent illustrations possible, of prayer being an end in itself, its own reward, the act of communion successfully accomplished and with no admixture of objective expectation.

T. B. Sanhedrin 22b says : "He who prays must regard the Shechinah as standing over against him, as it is said (Psalm xvi.), 'I have set the Lord before me continually.'" Taking "Shechinah" as denoting the idea of an immanent God, it is clear, that the object of this saying is to emphasise the nearness of the Deity, the possibility of maintaining a close fellowship with Him through the medium of prayer. God is not the far-off unapproachable monarch who has to be petitioned. One can only commune with a Shechinah, and not with a transcendent God.

The point, then, which we have attained by the preceding discussion is this : Firstly, it has been shown that prayer, in the Rabbinic view, must be based on the assumption of Transcendence and Immanence combined. Prayer is always addressed to a Person, a Person far mightier and far better than he who prays, a Person whose power to help or save, far exceeds that which we can attribute to any mundane being or to any of the impersonal powers vested in the universe. Here is Transcendence. But prayer gives also the assurance of the nearness of God, His abiding fellowship and companionship, and the ever-possible joys of communion. The basis of prayer is the likeness of the human soul to

God, and its capacity of love. For love is an emanation of God, and makes prayer possible through love's eternal longings for union with its source. Here is Immanence. Secondly, it has been shown from the numerous Rabbinical illustrations adduced, that communion rather than petition, is a substantial constituent of prayer, and that this communion is self-sufficient and self-satisfying. The satisfaction of prayer is not always the realisation of the outward. The communion is an end in itself, and the thrill of new inward vigour and blessedness that it infuses into the suppliant is often the supreme answer to the prayer.

But is it not obvious to even the tyro in Rabbinical literature, that the element of petition, although absent from a large portion of both public and private prayer, is present in very great degree in many instances, as is clear from the traditional Jewish liturgy? What answer, then, does Rabbinic theology afford to the difficulty created by the allegation of prayer being an attempt to persuade the Deity to interfere with the reign of inexorable natural law which holds sway in the universe?

Rabbinical thought is largely based upon the O.T. idea that the natural phenomena of the world are the messengers or agents of God. "Fire and hail; snow and vapour; stormy wind fulfilling His word" (Psalm cxlviii. 8). Natural law is part of God's regularised working. It is what we see and feel of His free-will as it acts on the universe. The uniformity of nature proves the perfect symmetry with which the moral and intelligent Artist of the universe works. To think that God could not grant an event to come to pass because it is contrary to what we know, is to make the Creator a slave, bound hand and foot by that which He has created. It is to limit His omni-

potence, curb His freedom, and deny His Transcendence. If, however, we willingly concede Him these three qualities, why should we hesitate to think that He is capable of superseding the working of some lower natural law, by the working of some higher natural law, and thus fulfil the petition of one who prays to Him ? Were we to adopt the immanent theory exclusively, there would certainly be cause for hesitation and doubt, because, as has been already shown, in any pantheistic form of religious thought there is little room for prayer. But with a theory of Transcendence and Immanence combined, the position should be intelligible. If God transcends the world, then there must necessarily be certain portions of His workings that are entirely beyond our ken—a goodly number of natural laws “doing the word” of the supreme Author of nature must be, as yet, unrevealed to us. Surely this lack of knowledge on our part gives us no passport to doubt or deny.

A significant passage from Genesis Rabba xii. 1 runs as follows : “It is written (Job xxvi. 14), ‘Lo, these are as parts of His ways ; but how little a portion is heard of Him ? But the thunder of His power who can understand ?’ R. Huna said all that thou seest is but part of the ways of God. . . . But the thunder of His power who can understand ? R. Huna said no man can understand anything about the thunder at the time that it comes out upon the world. . . . R. Huna further said, if it is impossible to understand its [i.e. the thunder’s] workings, how much more impossible is it to understand the working of the universe ?” It is upon this human inability to grasp the whole of the Divine scheme of things, that prayer is based. The proved uniformity of natural laws is no contradiction to the idea that there is a resourcefulness about an immanent and transcendent God

which men's ingenuity is too poor to explore. If only we knew more, we should see harmony where now we suspect opposition. Law is only our limited way of conceiving the operations of the Divine World-Spirit. God's work includes far more.*

But it will be asked, What about the "special providences" which figure so largely in the Rabbinic theology of prayer? How can these be brought into line with the established modern notions not only of the unchangeableness of natural law, but also, the unchangeable goodness of God? No one nowadays thinks of regarding the Deity otherwise than from the standpoint of the Psalmist's declaration, that "God is good unto all, and His mercy is upon all His works." The idea of God granting special favours, special privileges, special exemptions to certain individuals or classes of men in response to their prayers is becoming increasingly hard to reconcile with the modern conceptions of the unvarying universal Divine love and the unvarying wisdom and justice of His decrees. If e.g. one man prays to be vouchsafed a large share of worldly prosperity, and the prayer is granted, it means that either God will exert a special interference with the natural laws governing the productivity of the soil, or with the economic laws governing demand and supply, or it involves taking away aught of what another man tries to get, and the granting of preferential treatment to one above another. In all these cases, even if the problem of Divine intervention with law were got over in the way stated above, we should still be faced with the duty of explaining, how such prayers can be efficacious, when they involve an assumption which conflicts with the modern scientific conception of a good God?

The problems raised were not unfamiliar to the

* See, on this point, the *Pesikta Rabbati* (edit. Friedmann), p. 189.

Rabbins. The prayers which suggest these problems may be classified as follows :—

(a) Private prayers by individuals for their own private ends, such as health, prosperity, safety from enemies, recovery from disease. The technical name for these is אָרְכִּיָּה זְאַבֵּלָה, “ asking for his necessities.” These prayers were mostly extemporised ; their substance depended on exactly what the individual felt at the moment of prayer. But most noteworthy is the fact, they were not to constitute the whole of a man’s petitions. They were to be inserted at certain points in the canonical Eighteen Benedictions. The favourite place for inserting them was within the benediction called חֲמִצָּה חֲפָלָה. The following statement in T. B. Berachoth 31a bears this out : “ R. Hiya son of Ashi said in the name of Rab, that although they [the sages] said that a man must petition for his necessities in the חֲמִצָּה, yet, if, after his prayers [i.e. after the fixed Eighteen Benedictions], he wishes to utter petitions as long and numerous as the Abodah of the Kippur Day, he is at liberty to do so.” Thus, private petitions for favours did not occupy the highest rung on the ladder of prayer.

(b) Private prayers by individuals for needs of the collective body of Israel. These consisted of (1) the Eighteen Benedictions ; (2) certain additional petitions for the collective welfare, of which we have some very fine specimens on pages 16b, 17a of T. B. Berachoth, including those of R. Eliezer, R. Johanan, R. Zera, R. Hiya, Rab (Abba Arika) R. Judah the Prince, R. Saphra, R. Alexandri, Raba, and R. Shesheth. It is noteworthy that the staple of these prayers is for spiritual rather than for material blessings.

(c) Public prayers in synagogues. These include not only the “ petition-for-favours ” element, but also

such constituents of purer prayer as adoration, thanksgiving, confession, praise, aspiration, etc.

(d) Prayers by individuals or communities for the granting of a special favour which involves some Divine interference with the phenomena of the natural world, chiefly rain, of which we have instances in T. B. Ta'anith.⁽⁸⁾

This classification shows that (1) private petition occupies a place of only secondary prominence; (2) prayer is for spiritual as much as for material blessings; (3) prayer counts, among its factors, other acts of worship, as adoration, praise, etc., which, as has been hitherto remarked, are part and parcel of all mystical communion with the Deity. But we also find (1) the idea of God being moved to grant special indulgences as the consequence of some one's prayer, which must, in the long-run, result in injury to some one else. Success here must involve failure there. How can this be reconciled with the conception of a uniformly good God? (2) The idea of God interfering with the universal rules which govern natural phenomena, on the petition of an individual or community or nation, whereby while the suppliant or suppliants are revelling in the enjoyment of a specially-vouchsafed boon, others are enduring the pangs of drought or hunger or of some other defect or excess of nature's visitations.

The answers which seem the most plausible are as follows:—

(a) Prayers are mostly in the plural. It is the community of Israel that prays. When material benefits are prayed for, they are accordingly benefits for the whole congregation. This conclusion can be demonstrated from many ancient passages in the Jewish Liturgy. Hence, the praying for extra boons involves no injury to any section or individual of the body.

But, of course, when the broader issue of the inclusion of non-Jews as well as Jews in the prayer is faced, then the matter wears a different aspect. Rabbinism suffers from the shackles of a communal individualism. To the Rabbins a non-Jew was often a rebel against God. This particularism can largely be explained and justified on the grounds of the political and social treatment which the Jews endured at the hands of a non-Jewish environment. But the Rabbins often rose superior to their national exclusiveness. And the very fact that they could do so in *some instances*, sufficiently proves that *they might have done so in all instances*, had material circumstances not introduced an element of bitterness and repugnance into their attitude.

(b) It will be noticed that in private prayers recited by individuals, petitioning for worldly success or triumph over enemies, in many instances the request is not that the enemy should be crushed in the fray, but that God should fill his heart with a different spirit, so as to turn his opposition into love. The suppliant realised the goodness of God to all, and what he wanted was that all men should, by realising what this goodness meant, become good themselves. Thus prayer becomes aspiration : to pray for triumph in life's battle is to whisper, as it were, into God's ear, asking Him to make all men as brothers ; and where such love abounds, there is plenty for every one, and happiness and triumph is the portion of every one's cup.

(c) The Divine Fatherhood occupies a great place in Rabbinic prayer. Men are in the position of children towards their father. The child formulates requests of all kinds, some which are rightful and discreet, and therefore deserve to be answered ; others, which to the greater wisdom of the father appear obnoxious, and if answered would be fraught with

injury either to the child or to others or to both, must for ever remain unanswered. So it is with prayers directed to the Divine Father. We throw ourselves upon His wider knowledge.* We tabulate our wants, and some of them are thoughtless and others savour of greed. But all the while we know that God will exercise His wisdom before granting them. We know that He will only be moved to grant what is expedient, and will certainly reject the supplication that is importunate and unseemly. In fact, we believe that God reads the wishes of our hearts even before we express them in words.† And yet, we pray! Why? Because we yearn to put ourselves *en rapport* with God. We want to have conscious communion with Him. We feel it an inestimable privilege to draw ourselves so near Him, and to draw Him so near us, by the cords of prayer. It is this very fact that constitutes the quintessence, not only of the act of prayer, but of the answer to prayer. Energies which before were latent, now become operative. We feel that we have transacted something; and although we do not know how, we are nevertheless assured that there has been some objective response to our petition. The final test in all these is, after all, our experience. When the Jewish mother has uttered a prayer for the recovery of her sick child, however deeply she may realise the truth that God cannot be expected to alter the laws of nature for her or her child's sake, yet her experience is that of having effected something for

* As e.g. in T. B. Berachoth 29b: "The wants of Thy people Israel are many, and their intelligence ($\delta\mu\gamma\eta$) is small." This is certainly a childlike attitude. The child cannot tell his ailment to his father, cannot locate his pain. And the father knows what is good and what is not good for the child, far better than the child knows.

† T. B. Yebamoth 64a says, "God yearns for the prayer of the righteous." This implies that God knows beforehand what the righteous suppliant desires from Him, but yet He wants him to pray. God desires the communion with man, hence man reciprocates it.

the better. And the volume of human testimony to this experience is too considerable to be set aside as a thing of nought.

(d) There is an interdependence of faith and works in the Rabbinic theology. So in prayer, its ideal is found in the closest possible combination with works. Thus, we ask God for such and such a favour. To expect it might, to the outsider, seem to expect something which is an unwarrantable interference with the laws of nature. But what really happens is this: the prayer is the great incentive to our endeavouring to do our part in making possible the obtaining of that for which we ask. We ask for fertile fields and fruitful orchards. But, in the asking, we imply that we will do our share of human labour in tilling the soil, watering and manuring it, and studying the necessary climatic conditions which govern the land. We ask for abundant success in commercial enterprises. But the asking must be accompanied by silent inner endeavour that we will put forth the necessary act of will in so far as it is incumbent upon us to do.⁽⁹⁾ And not only so, but it implies that our act of will must be *en rapport* with the Divine will. And thus prayer leads us on to a self-sanctification in the conduct of life.* It encourages us to look for results which lie quite outside the range of ordinary expectation, provided we realise what a power there lies in our own work.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XXIV

(1) The Targum has זָלִי "and prayed." The idea of judgment is seen better in Exodus xxi. 22, זָהָן בְּפָלִילִים.

(2) In Sifri on פָּרָשָׁת שְׁמַנְיָה this passage is given, but with one or two different expressions. Twelve names for prayer are there mentioned,

* Perhaps it is this aspect of the efficacy of prayer which is alluded to in T. B. Berachoth 32b, "Prayer is greater than good deeds." For a full treatment of the subject of Rabbinic prayer, the reader is referred to the able essay by Israel Abrahams in *J.Q.R.* vol. xx.

not ten (see Friedmann's edition, p. 70). In *Yalkut* on same passage, as many as thirteen are enumerated. In *Tanhuma* (edition Buber) only nine are given.

(3) See *שער השבח והלבנות* in *שע"ר*, chapter iii. Cp. W. G. Greg (*The Creed of Christendom*, p. 122): "Communion with God, we must ever bear in mind, is something very different from prayer for specific blessings, and often confers the submissive strength of soul for which we pray; and we believe it will be found that the higher our souls rise in their spiritual progress, the more does entreaty merge into thanksgiving, the more does petition become absorbed in communion with the 'Father of the spirits of all flesh.'"

(4) Cp. on fixed forms of prayer Maimonides, *מלחנין* הל' חטלה, chapter i. He says: ". . . אלא חביב מזוה ו כר הווא שידרא . . . אומת טהון וו" . . .". The divisions here are (i.) supplication, (ii.) praise, (iii.) petition for needs, (iv.) gratitude, (v.) impromptu utterance (implied in כר הווא שידרא, i.e. in no fixed formula of prayer). It is clear that according to Maimonides, petition only formed a comparatively small element in prayer. That Maimonides was a great supporter of extemporaneous unfixed form of prayer is seen from his following remarks, into which we shall not here enter (i. 3). He gives, as the reasons for fixed prayers, the fact that after the Exile the Jews became intermixed with many nations and thus came to speak many languages. But the average Jew was never so thoroughly conversant with any one language as to be able to give complete utterance to his prayer in that language. And his Hebrew knowledge was none too great. Consequently he would intermix his Hebrew wording with phrases belonging to other languages, and thus confusion would arise. This gave the impetus to Ezra and his followers to fix the Eighteen Benedictions. And after these came other prayers, so that there was a fixed uniformity of prayer for all Israel and no one had to depend on his own powers of extemporalisation.

(5) F. W. Newman, *The Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations* (6d. edition, pp. 193-194).

(6) This idea of כהונת plays a great part in the Rabbinic maxims and doctrines about Prayer. See e.g. Mishna Berachoth vi. about the תחבירים הרשומים. Further references are given in the article "Kavanah" in *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vii.; also at foot of the article on Luria in vol. viii. For כהונת בראות cp. also T. B. Megillah 20a, Hullin 31a, b.

(7) This interpretation of the exceedingly difficult phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" is, of course, open to question. As a matter of fact, the phrase seems to embrace not one or two but a number of differing teachings. Bousset (*Die Religion des Judenthums im N.T. Zeitalter*, pp. 199-203) dwells on these. Thus, in the O.T. it refers at times to a future kingship of God, and at times to a present one. Examples of the latter are Psalm cxlv. 13, "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations"; Daniel iv. 34, "Whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and His kingdom is from generation to generation." Examples of the former are Obadiah 21, "And the kingdom shall be the Lord's"; Micah iv. 7,

"And the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever"; Zechariah xiv. 9, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth." These are only a selected few out of quite a number. In Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature, as Bousset points out, it also bears the same double meaning. In all probability each of the O.T. writers who used the phrase meant something different by it. In the Rabbinical writings the variations in meaning are greater. They may be roughly classified as follows: (a) the acceptance of the Torah by the Israelites at Sinai; (b) the abandonment of idolatry; (c) the advance from slavery to freedom, i.e. the throwing off the yoke of man to assume the yoke of the kingdom of God; (d) the recognition by the Jew of God's unity; (e) the Jewish national hope in Roman times to be delivered from the yoke of Rome; (f) the Jewish longing for the universal recognition of the Jewish God (as reflected in the "Kaddish" and "Allenu" prayers, and New Year services). Examples of all these could be easily culled from the domains of the Rabbinic literature. It is however quite possible to ascribe a mystical meaning to many a Rabbinic usage of the expression. In taking upon himself the Kingdom of God, the Jew undoubtedly thought of the nearness of God to him and of the Divine companionship which ever enshrouded him and his race. Such is the view of Nahmanides in his commentary on Deut. xxxiii. 5, "And he was king in Jeshurun." That it forms part of the mysticism of prayer is seen from the passage in T. B. Berachoth 10b where it is said: "Whosoever eats and drinks previous to praying, of him it is said, And me hast thou cast behind thy back (1 Kings xiv. 9). Do not say 'thy back' (תַּחַת) but 'thy pride' (עֲצָמָה), i.e. after priding himself (with food and drink) this man takes upon himself the Kingdom of Heaven."

(8) This subject is elaborated with great fulness throughout the tractate T. B. Ta'anith. The whole of the second chapter deals with the circumstances, conditions, ceremonials, etc., surrounding the fasting which was indulged in by individuals and communities in order to invoke the Divine gift of rain. The large miraculous element, as in the tale of נקיטין בנוין (one of three philanthropists in the first century A.D., see Gittin 56a, Lam. Rabba i. 5, etc.) in the third chapter, is another significant illustration of the point. More noteworthy are remarks in the first chapter, like טרננה תירן נקיין בנוין (9a), or טרננה בנוין נקיין בנוין (9b). The Rabbins evidently drew a potent distinction between the relative efficacy of private and public prayer. Whether their scattered remarks on this head are merely the sporadic utterances of different teachers with no connecting thread of a common thought, or whether they are the expressions of different phases of some fixed theological theories on prayer, is hard to prove. A collection of all the passages might possibly lead one to the latter view.

(9) Significant is the remark in Abot De R. Nathan xxi. (edit. Schechter) that God did not make His Shechinah to rest upon the Israelites in the desert, until they had put their hands to the work of the Tabernacle.

CHAPTER XXV

THE COMPATIBILITY OF MYSTICISM AND RABBINIC THEOLOGY

RABBINIC theology possesses a strongly pronounced mystical element, because, as the preceding pages have tried to show, it teaches the doctrine of the Immanence of God, and the Immanence of God is the central core of mysticism. What has always to be borne in mind is the distinction between what one might term official mysticism, *i.e.* mysticism as an occult science, the mysticism of the Kabbalah, its theosophy, the doctrines of the professional mystics, and a plainer and more general teaching about the possibility of man's communion with God, and the reality of the bond uniting God to man at all times. It is this broad and comprehensive aspect of mysticism which has constituted the staple of the present treatise, although, as has already been shown earlier in these pages, many of the recondite doctrines which pervade the mediæval Kabbalistic literature can be clearly traced back to the Talmud and Midrashim.

Mysticism, of whatever phase, must by its very nature be the most individualistic type of religion. The mystic believes in God not because he has been taught to believe in Him, whether by books or by men, but because he can experience God. It is his *own* intellect in combination with his *own* feeling that makes God

a reality to him. There is a contact between human spirit and Divine spirit. And this contact, to him, is an immediate and self-verified conviction. It is something that goes on in the silence of his own soul. No one else can know what it is in the way that he does. It is a subjective fact. His neighbour may have it or he may not have it. But what he knows and feels of God is exclusively *his*. His worship of God and his praying to Him are the result of his *own* realisation of the Divine Presence in him and in the universe in so far as *he himself* can judge. On these first-hand perceptions—and on these alone—is his religion based. All else is beside the mark. The religion of authority, of tradition, of history, as embodied in books or codes, makes no appeal to him. It is second-hand and doubtful. Now, can such things be said of the Jew who lived under an obedience to the religion of the Rabbis? The question is vital. One of the distinguishing marks of Rabbinical Judaism, is its persistent and pervading formalism. It is a superimposed discipline. It gives little room for individual initiative. The individual has to sink his own idiosyncrasies and merge himself in the main body. The external plays a dominating part. Authority looms large everywhere. History and tradition lay down their prescriptions, and exact a uniformity of homage. Experimental religion is overshadowed. The Jew has to believe that which his brethren in faith believe. He has to pray the set prayers which they pray; he has to observe the ceremonies, and respect the traditions, which they observe and respect. In the face of these facts, how can the existence of a mystical element in the Rabbinic theology be consistently maintained?

In the great work of Baron Von Hügel which has already been alluded to more than once in these pages,

there is an illuminating chapter (vol. i. chap. ii.) in which he shows how all religions, as they emerge from their common anterior stage of fetichism, gather round them elements which belong to tradition, history, and the social relations of men and nations generally. "Never has religion," says he, "been purely and entirely individual; always has it been as truly and necessarily social and institutional, traditional and historical." The growth of religion amongst the paramount races of mankind, is analogous to the gradual development, by stages, of the powers of thought and feeling in the human mind. The child accepts facts because they are told him. This, that, and the other, are true or untrue, desirable or the reverse, just because his father or nurse or tutor tells him so. What makes its appeal to him and imprints itself on his memory, are external scenes. The words spoken by some one in authority over him impress him, and elicit an unquestioning obedience. He has not the faculty to individualise, to sift for himself, to challenge what he has been told or what he has seen by ideas or truths of his own formation. These capacities come only with the next stage. As the child grows into a youth, another factor comes into play —the mystery of his personality. He refuses to take uncritically what he sees and what others tell him. He begins to argue and form opinions of his own. He gets to understand that these opinions are his own, and have no necessary relation with the opinions of others. In this way he develops an outlook upon life. He co-ordinates and classifies facts and ideas, sifting the true from the false, the good from the bad. He systematises. In short, he thinks. Then comes the third stage, when the multiplicity of sense-impressions combined with the complex processes of cognition and reflexion issue in volition and emotion. Thinking,

feeling, and acting, properly so called, are all brought into existence. And then the human character is completed.

But, although all this is a true and scientific account of the natural history of the mind's growth, it must not be supposed that these three stages never overlap. They do. Some rudiments of the one are always to be found in the other. The infant is not exclusively given up to sense-impressions. Some germs of the higher processes of cognition and will-power certainly invade his mental world. And, conversely, the highest and most elaborated volitional effort of the adult, is never at any moment free from an admixture of the elementary sense-impressions which characterise childhood.

Religions grow by stages analogous to these. There is, firstly, the primitive stage, when men believed simply because and as they were told. It was an uncritical obedience to external authority. Tradition and legends came to them out of the mists of an antiquity too far back to be traced. They were shared equally by all the members of the tribe or clan or nation. The religion of one differed in no essential particular from that of the other. In fact, it was just this common inheritance that brought about a spirit of socialisation among the members. The uniform obedience to the ancient inherited traditional cultus, forged the link which bound man to his neighbour in the arena of everyday life. But, with the flow of time, a higher plane in the religious existence was reached. Thought and literature began to assert their sway. Men wanted to know the reason for the things they accepted or rejected. Speakers and writers arose to guide and educate men's thoughts, to strengthen the consciousness of right and justice, to allay unnecessary fears and doubtings, to eliminate wrong and harmful conceptions. Religion, in short,

became based on intellect. But yet another ascent had to be made before religion came to full power. The emotional feature appeared on the scene. Religion must be believed in, not, as in the former cases, because it is authoritative, nor merely because it consorts with the reasoning powers, but because it is *felt* to be true, it is *felt* to answer men's eternal longings and aspirations. Here we have the individualising element. As each man's emotions, needs, and longings must differ, so must each man's religion differ. Each man *lives* his religion in his own way. This is the dominant characteristic of mysticism. And, to complete the analogy, there is the same overlapping of the stages here, as we saw in the case of the child's mind-growth. The rudimentary and outward were never without the complexities and elaborations of the advanced inward. And, on the other hand, in the most highly developed fact of inward speculative religion, there was the unfailing presence of the crude and early conception. Combination always. Separation never.*

The aforesaid is a free *résumé* of Von Hügel's ingenious analysis. It is as true an account of the evolution of the religion of Israel as of the evolution of Christianity, though always on the assumption that the three elements are never utterly apart, but ever exist in some degree of combination or coalescence, at each successive stage of the nation's life.

In early Israel the authoritative, external, formal aspect of religion was embodied mainly in the sacrificial code. It was a cultus handed down from father to son

* M. Loisy says: "Preceding worships never cease to maintain themselves, in spite of everything, in higher and newer religions. Polytheism has a tendency to survive in monotheism; while fetishism, and even magic, are able to lodge themselves more or less in religions which profess a theoretical monotheism and which were established on that principle" (*The Religion of Israel*, p. 50).

Dr. Farnell, dealing with the development of prayer from lower to higher forms, expounds a similar view (*The Evolution of Religion*, pp. 164-173).

throughout generations without a break. That the sacrifices wielded a strong social influence, is seen from numerous allusions throughout the O.T. They constituted meals which had to be eaten in common.* They brought priests and laity into the closest mutual contact. Later Israel brings us to the religion of prophets and psalmists. Here the intellectual side is uppermost. Isaiah and Micah, Hosea and Amos in denouncing, as they so unsparingly did, the sacrificial vogue of their day, were in reality pleading for an abandonment of formalism in favour of a religious rationalism. Instead of thinking that God delights in thousands of rams, in myriads of rivers of oil, they wanted the people to know what is implied by the term "God," what ethical and religious obligations and beliefs necessarily spring from this knowledge. Not till the exilic period do we reach the third and highest conception of religion. There are unmistakable touches of mysticism in some of the exilic Psalms as well as in the prophecies of the second Isaiah. And later on, under Hellenistic influences, we meet with the ideas of an immanent wisdom and an immanent Logos; while in Palestine not only were there the Essenes with their rigorously contemplative and speculative system of life and doctrine, but many an individual teacher who taught the esoteric doctrines of the בראות "ם and מרכבת "ם. And flowing parallel with all this—and continuing to flow long after the others had ceased—was the stream of deep-seated and widely-ramified belief in the "Shechinah" and "Holy Spirit," and kindred teachings, to the elucidation of which this treatise has so largely applied itself.

Here again the point to be emphasised is: that these three elements *always intermingled* in some

* Like the Greek *ἱέρειον*, the Hebrew *מִשְׁבֵּת* has in the O.T. a twofold meaning: (1) a sacrifice, (2) a feast (cp. Proverbs xvii. 1). See Mahaffy's *Old Greek Life*, p. 82.

degree or other. The sacrificial system, even in the most primitive epoch which falls within the period covered by the O.T., was accompanied by some rudiments of inward spirituality. The Book of Deuteronomy is, according to modern critics, a product of the prophetic age, when religion became more a matter of the inwardness of the individual mind than of the outward conformity to a general norm or authority ; but Deuteronomy could only proceed as far as to effect the centralisation of the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem. It could not suppress that cult altogether. The Rabbinical epoch for the most part, embraces the time after the cessation of sacrifices. Yet, the immense importance of sacrifices could not be forgotten or even minimised. It has already been shown how deep a mystical element pervades the Rabbinic notions of Prayer. But prayer was actually stated by the Rabbis over and over again to be but a substitute for the defunct sacrifice. See T. B. Berachoth 15a, 14b, Menaḥoth 110a, Ketuboth 105b, Yoma 71a and b. And looking yet farther down the stream of Judaic thought, the combination of these three currents is even more conspicuous. It can be seen and studied in personalities, some of whom hold immortal place in Jewish literature.*

Can mysticism, which is the most subjective type of religion, consist with Rabbinism, which is a body of objective teachings, in which formalism and tradition demand a more or less general and uniform obedience ?

* Joseph Caro (1488-1575), as the codifier, *par excellence*, of the Jewish ritual and of the whole body of Rabbinic legalism, takes front rank as the exemplar of the authoritative, traditional, external aspect of religion. But he was yet an ardent and confirmed mystic. His *Maggid Mesharim*, with its heavenly visions and weird admonitions on all sorts of things, clearly shows the extreme mystical bent of his mind. It is the most unbalanced book that one could read ! Nahmanides (1194-1270) was a rigid and dogmatic advocate of the "six hundred and thirteen precepts of the Torah." But his mystical enthusiasms are well known to every student of his works.

But there is no known instance in the case of any of the world's religions, where the combination has *not* been known to exist—and to exist without involving even a suspicion of self-contradiction.* A purely mystical religion is as much an abstraction as a purely traditional and formal one. But how is the co-existence to be accounted for?

It is to be accounted for in this way: As, according to hypothesis, there must be a mystical element in all religions, every man of religion must be something of a mystic. The mystic relies for his knowledge of God upon his own innate faculties. It is his innate moral sense that makes him reverence God as righteous and just. It is his innate sense of cause that makes him fear God as the author of all, the omnipotent and omniscient. There is another inborn spiritual sense within him—call it a soul—that reveals to him the stupendous fact, that God is a God of love. Now, these natural endowments of man are, as it were, the test of the truth or untruth of that other constituent of religion, viz. the revealed, authoritative, traditional, historical, etc. The latter is ever brought to the touchstone of the former. Let us see how this arrangement works in the case of the Rabbinic theology and religion. Take the Bible. The Rabbinic Jew's belief in its truth, his reverence for it as the word of God, his readiness to obey its behests sprang, in reality, ou-

* Miss Evelyn Underhill says: "The view which regards the mystic as spiritual anarchist receives little support from history, which shows us, again and over again, the great mystics as faithful sons of the great religions. All any religious system which fosters unearthly love, is potentially a nursery of mystics; and Christianity, Islam, Brahmanism and Buddhism each received its most sublime interpretation at their hands. Thus, St. Teresa interprets the ecstasies apprehension of the Godhead in strictly Catholic terms. Thus Boehme believed to the last that his explorations of eternity were consistent with the teachings of the Lutheran Church. Thus, the Sufis were good Mohammedans, Philo and the Kabbalists were orthodox Jews. Thus Plotinus even adapted, though with what difficulty!—the relics of paganism to his doctrine of the Real" (*Mysticism*, p. 115).

of a combination of two inward convictions. These were (1) the fact that the Bible is the Torah and contained the words of God revealed to Israel, at a certain period of the latter's history ; (2) the fact that the teachings of the Bible about God, morality, and duty coincided with, and were borne out and verified by, what his first-hand spiritual experiences told him about these matters. The first of these, he had been born into. It was a part of his religion, which existed long before he came into existence. And it was shared in, by all who professed the same faith as he. The second, he made for himself. It was the resultant fruit of the usage of those powers of his, with which he was innately dowered. It was his individual view. It was this individual view which was the unremitting judge and critic of the other. If that which he directly apprehended of God, whether by his intellectual or spiritual sense, did not tally with the external authority that told him that the Bible was a divine book, then he must reject the divinity of the Bible. If, again, his intellectual or spiritual sense told him that the Bible was a divine book, but that certain sections of it belonged to a lower order of thought than that which he was accustomed to reverence, and were the work of men of inferior moral and intellectual calibre, then he must refuse homage to those sections on the grounds that they conflicted with his own intuitions of what was right, true, and godly. Such seems to be the only logical outcome of the position. Now, how did the Rabbins look at the Bible ? The Mishna (Sanhedrin x. or in some versions xi.) says, that among those who have no portion in the world to come is "he who denies the divine origin of the Torah"; a later anonymous Baraita (T. B. Sanhedrin 99a) explains this pronouncement to mean : "Even if he asserted that all the Torah is of Divine origin except such and such a verse,

which was said not by God but by Moses." Here is a typical instance of how the Rabbinic Jew bows to the religion of authority—the external. But we know that this bowing was spontaneous, natural, not forced or artificial. How came this about? Because that other element of his religion, the intuitive and subjective, exactly tallied with it. The Rabbinic Jew who lived the life advocated by the Torah, *felt* that *that* life, and no other, satisfied most truly the deepest quest of his soul. The Torah enacted certain ordinances, and made their obedience obligatory to him. The Jew correspondingly felt that his only means for bringing God near to him, and for his realising this nearness of God, was this obedience. It was only as a son of the Torah that communion with God was possible to him. On any other grounds it was unthinkable. It is probably, by the way, out of these roots that there sprang the multitude of sayings scattered throughout the Talmud and Midrashim (many of which are far too exaggerated to be either logical or true) on the incomparable worth of the Torah. Ideas such as that of Genesis Rabba i. about God holding counsel with the Torah before creating the world, or that of T. B. Abodah Zara 3b about God Himself sitting and studying the Torah, merely reflect this view of the Torah as answering the demands of inner as well as outer religion.

Another example is the Sabbath. The Rabbinic Sabbath is a grand specimen of what Von Hügel calls institutional religion. One can well picture the baby of the Rabbinic epoch, born into an arena where the strict formalism of the Sabbath reigns supreme. As he grows from babyhood to boyhood and thence to manhood, so the numberless ordinances of the "This thou shalt do on the Sabbath," or, "This thou shalt not do on the Sabbath," the אַבְוֹת מֶלֶאכָה ט"ז, grow round

him with an ever-increasing sternness. But with the growth of the external obligations, there goes hand in hand a corresponding quickening of his own subjective impulses to look upon the Sabbath as the acme of spiritual joy. In other words, the Jew felt inwardly, that that which authority commanded answered exactly to the promptings of his own breast. The Sabbath of tradition was the counterpart of his own heart's Sabbath. A good illustration of this feeling is afforded by a Baraita in T. B. Betsa 16a : "They said concerning Shammai the Elder that throughout all his days whatsoever he ate was in honour of the Sabbath. Should he alight upon a fine beast, he would say, 'Let this be for the Sabbath.' Should he afterwards find a finer one, he would leave it and partake only of the first." To understand the drift of this saying, one has to remember that the Rabbinic precept about the honouring of the Sabbath is based on the word וְנִבְדֹּל, "and thou shalt honour it" (Isaiah lviii. 13), which was explained as meaning, "כִּבְדָּה בְּכֻסֹּת נֶקְה וּמַ" that it was to be honoured by our wearing better clothes, eating better food, etc. etc. By the man of no ideals, this obligation would be carried out mechanically. But to a Shammai, the observance of the Sabbath was the welcome opportunity of a joyous union of the soul with God. Hence the smallest act performed during the week, was felt to have some bearing upon the Sabbath's sanctified joy. Hence again the externality of the command to keep the Sabbath became absorbed, eclipsed, lost, in the inwardness of the response which it elicited. And the same course of reasoning applies to the external, authoritative, religious ordinances which depend on signal events in the history of the nation. The Jew commemorated the Passover because his Bible and his Rabbinic teachers bade him do so. But this is only half

the truth. He commemorated the Passover because there was a corresponding inward prompting which told him, that the God who was with Israel in Egypt was with him and with his race then, that there was an immanent Shechinah in Israel.

Such is the explanation of the harmonious co-existence of the traditional and mystical in Rabbinism. The authoritativeness of the traditional element is of the strongest possible. It is sacrosanct. It is of God. Yet it would never have found the endorsement it did, unless there were hearts and souls attuned to its apprehension as the word of God.

This interweaving of the mystic and the traditional in Rabbinic Judaism, has proved the finest corrective for mysticism, as well as the safest anchorage for traditionalism. It preserved Rabbinic Judaism from fossilisation. It saved the spiritual elements of prayer. A Talmudic injunction like that of R. Meir that it is the duty of every one to utter one hundred Benedictions daily (T. B. *Menahoth* 43b) might, by its very mechanism, have dealt the death-blow to prayer among the enlightened. But its possible evil effects were counterbalanced by the advice R. Hana b. Bizna (a Babylonian Amora of third and fourth centuries) gave, in the name of R. Simeon Hasida, to the effect that : "He that prays must look upon himself as though the Shechinah were standing over against him, as it is said, 'I have set the Lord before me continually'" (T. B. *Sanhedrin* 22b). The external command, "Pray because you are bidden," is softened by the internal bidding, "Pray because God is so near. He is the ever-present Shechinah." Prayer thus retains its validity, because it is a blend of the formalism of tradition, with individual independence of feeling. A man prays because he wants to, as well as because a rule tells him to. The modern

critic of the Rabbinic formalism rather unfairly leaves out of his reckoning the large place which the Rabbins assigned to the mutual movement ever going on between the human soul and God, which they designated as Love. Such phrases as *וְהַמֵּן לְבָנָא בְּשִׁיר*, "God requires the heart," or *כֹּל מָה שָׁאַתָּם עֲשִׂים לֹא תְעַשׂ אֶלָּא*, "Whatsoever ye do, let it be done out of love," taken in conjunction with the many-sided usages of the phrases "Shechinah" and "Holy Spirit," clearly point to an emphatic insistence upon the subjective element in religion. The point might afford ample material for the theme of a separate monograph.

But, on the other hand, it is just the authoritativeness of Rabbinism that has rescued its mysticism from the gravest intellectual and moral dangers into which all enthusiastic mysticism is apt to run. For what does this authoritativeness in this particular connexion amount to? It amounts to an assertion of the transcendent personality of God. God as lawgiver, as judge, as father, is infinitely over and above man, and cannot be compared with him. The Rabbinic Jew was made to feel at every step, this extreme *otherness* of God. What he had was, contact with God, the constant companionship of God, ever-present possibility of union with God, but never identity with God—that great snare of so many a mystic. God was immanent, yet transcendent at the same time. The gulf between the human and the divine was never narrowed. Perhaps the most potent illustration of this truth, is afforded us by the old Rabbinic homilies on the Song of Songs. The pivot on which all these homilies turn, is the assumption that there is a real betrothal between God and Israel. At one time Israel is the bride, at another, the newly-wedded wife of God. The reader breathes the atmosphere of the wedding-feast.

A characteristic passage, and one which epitomises the subject well, occurs in Song of Songs Rabba iv. 10 (given also with some slight variations in Deut. Rabba ii. 37) as follows : "In ten places [in the O.T.] are the Israelites designated as 'bride,' six here [*i.e.* in the Song of Songs] and four in the Prophets . . . and in ten corresponding passages, is God represented as arrayed in garments (which display the dignity of manhood in the ideal bridegroom). . . ." It is unnecessary here to reproduce the Scriptural allusions on which these statements are based. But, that they form a good specimen of ever so many Rabbinic pictures, where the union of Israel with God is likened to a marriage, is certain. The mystical implications of them' cannot be better described than by quoting the words of two eminent English theologians. "But behind and after this," says Francis William Newman in his book on *The Soul, its Sorrows and its Aspirations*, "there is a mystery, revealed to but few, which thou, O Reader, must take to heart. Namely, if thy soul is to go on into higher spiritual blessedness, it must become a *woman*. . . . It must learn to love being dependent. . . . It must not have recourse to Him merely as to a Friend in need under the strain of duty, the battering of affliction, and the failure of human sympathy; but it must press towards Him when there is *no* need. It must love to pour out its thoughts for the pleasure of pouring them out . . ." (p. 190, People's 6d. edition). Again, says Newman (pp. 196, 197): "Spiritual persons have exhausted human relationships in the vain attempt to express their full sense of what God (or Christ) is to them. Father, Brother, Friend, King, Master, Shepherd, Guide are common titles. In other figures God is their Tower, their Glory, their Rock, their Shield, their Sun, their Star, their Joy, their Portion, their Hope, their Trust,

their Life. But what has been said will show why a still tenderer tie has ordinarily presented itself to the Christian imagination as a very appropriate metaphor—that of *Marriage*. The habit of breathing to God our most secret sorrows, hopes, complaints and wishes, in unheard whisper, with the consciousness that He is always inseparable from our being, perhaps pressed this comparison forward.” How applicable to Rabbinic theology are these beautiful words which Newman would seem to confine to the theology of Christianity ! R. A. Armstrong (*God and the Soul*, p. 163) says : “The union of man with God must be like a marriage. The more perfect the union of will and feeling between man and woman in marriage, the more perfect is the marriage. But the very essence of marriage consists in the separate personalities of the two thus joined together. It is the sense of union not with self, but with another than self, that constitutes all the beauty and solemnity of marriage. And in like manner it is the sense of union with Another, even with God, always other than self, however self be penetrated by God, that constitutes all the truth and holiness of religion.”

There can be no greater truism, as far as the Jew of Rabbinic times is concerned, than that his union with God was, as Armstrong has said, a union “with another than self.” He never for an instant forgot that “however self be penetrated by God” yet was God other and transcendently greater than he, his Master, King, Shepherd, and Guide. In fine, the “God-within” idea coalesced with the “God-without” idea. The external, traditional, institutional element in his religion, went hand in hand with his conviction of the Immanence of God.

It is on these grounds that Judaism in the centuries covered by the Rabbinical literature had no reason to

fear the dangers so often consequent upon mysticism. But things were different in subsequent ages. The truce was broken. Mysticism became a menace to Rabbinism. The danger is reflected, for all time, in the bitter feuds that raged between the Talmudists and the Kabbalists. The career of Shabbatai Tsevi (1626–1676) is an immortal illustration of the perils of an unbalanced mysticism. It is not difficult to detect and to analyse the underlying causes of this dangerous degeneracy. Where mysticism is liable to run amock is, in its mistaking the *contact* of man with God, for the *identity* of man with God. There is a twofold outcome of this mistake. Firstly, the extreme mystic is prone to believe that not only his good, but also his evil, disposition is part and parcel of Deity. Sin becomes sanctified, hence a life of vice is justifiable. Secondly, he is liable to excite in others a feeling of worshipful veneration for himself, as though he himself were some sort of deity, or, anyhow, a being far nearer the sphere of the Divine than any one else. It is easy to see how once such an impression gets a firm footing, it can be used as a tool for effecting the vilest kinds of chicanery and immorality. The inglorious career of Shabbatai Tsevi as well as the deception which marks the public and private life of many a “Tsaddik” among the Hassidim, and vitiates the conduct of many of the Hassidim themselves, can clearly be traced to this polluted source.

Rabbinism survived the trials and assaults of time because, while judiciously blending with itself a measure of that mysticism without which, as has been already said, no religion can survive, it never allowed its main stream to lose itself in a side-current of this kind. What Baron Von Hügel (*Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. i. pp. 72, 73) so charmingly says of religion in

general, is thoroughly true of the religion of Judaism during the Rabbinic era : "Only full trust, only unconditional surrender, suffice for religion. But then religion excites and commands this in a person towards a Person ; a surrender to be achieved, not in some thing but in some one,—a some one who *is* at all only in as much as he is living, loving, growing ; and to be performed, not towards some thing, but towards Some One, Whose right, indeed whose very power to claim me, consists precisely in that He is Himself absolutely, infinitely and actually, what I am but derivatively, finitely and potentially."

CHAPTER XXVI

CHRONOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT

THE Rabbinical literature discussed in the preceding pages covers many centuries. It includes (*a*) the Talmud, (*b*) the Midrashim. The earliest date associated with the former, is that of the pre-Tannaites or "Zekenim Há-Reshonim," starting with Antigonus of Socho, who flourished about the first half of the third century B.C., and was, according to the Mishna (Aboth i.), the disciple and successor of Simon the Just. The last of these were Hillel and Shammai. Following on the demise of these, there commenced the period of the Tannaim, lasting from the commencement of the Christian era until about the first quarter of the third century A.D.; Hillel and Shammai belong to the last pre-Christian century. As the references to the pre-Tannaites in the Talmud are rare, in all probability their influence upon their successors was small. Hillel and Shammai, however, stand out as real forces in the religious development of their age. With them, and the band of Tannaim that succeeded to their teachings, the Talmudic *age proper* may be said to have commenced. Hence, the *terminus a quo* of Talmudic literature must be assigned roughly to the opening years of the first Christian century. The *terminus ad quem* is the close of the epoch of the Saboraim, which, according to the famous letter of R.

Sherira (edit. Neubauer in *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, i. 180), would be toward the end of the second half of the sixth century. Hence the Talmud, speaking generally, covers a six hundred years' literary activity. In the case of the Midrashim, the matter of dates is rather more complicated. Account must be taken of the great distance of time intervening between the year or century when a particular Midrash assumed final shape and redaction as a whole, and the year or century when several independent passages inside that Midrash were orally uttered by their particular authors. Thus e.g. take a Midrash like the Tanhuma. The researches of Buber have shown that three different and independent collections are comprised in it. R. Tanhuma (an Amora of the fourth century) was only responsible for a small proportion of the material; the work was not edited till the fifth century. It used to be thought, judging from internal evidence, that R. Hoshiah (an Amora of the third century) was the author of the Bereshit Rabba. Modern research, however, has proved conclusively, that only the general outline of the Midrash can be traced to Hoshiah; the greater portion belongs to the sixth century, or even later. In the case, again, of such a work as the Tanna Debe Elijahu it is comparatively easy to distinguish the early sections belonging to the Amoraic period, from the later additions which were written by an anonymous author who redacted the whole work in the tenth century. And so with several other works belonging to the Midrashic literature. The researches of Zunz, Hoffmann, Bacher, and others would lead us to stretch back the origin of Midrash to the age of the "Soferim." These "Soferim" besides orally translating the Law into the vernacular, added interpretations of their own, which after being orally handled by successive generations

became finally written down in the earliest Midrashim, such as *Sifra*, *Mechilta*, *Bereshit Rabba*, etc. Indeed, the early origin of much Midrashic literature is seen from the fact that traces of it are to be found in many of the pre-Christian Apocalypses, as well as in the Apocrypha, the works of Josephus and Philo, and in some of the lesser-known specimens of Jewish-Hellenistic literature.* As regards the written Midrash, it is impossible to fix a precise date. One can only speak of periods or centuries or schools. The oldest are the schools of R. Akiba and R. Ishmael, both of whom belong to the Tannaim of the first and second centuries A.D. The *Mechilta*, part of *Sifra* and *Sifri*, belong to this age, and that there are Tannaitic elements in *Genesis Rabba* is undoubted. The *terminus a quo* then, in the case of Midrashic literature is the first century A.D. The *terminus ad quem* brings us right into the Middle Ages, as Jellinek in his *Beth-Ha-Midrash* has proved. But many of these late Midrashim are of little critical value for purposes of tracing development of ideas, seeing that they are mere excerpts or condensed forms or repetitions of the earlier Midrashim. None of them have been quoted or drawn upon in the present treatise. Its survey ends chronologically with the *Yalkut* (*i.e.* *Yalkut Shim'oni*), which Epstein has shown conclusively (in *Ha-Hoker*, i. 85-93, 129-137) to belong to the thirteenth century. But the *Yalkut* is also no criterion as to development of thought, seeing that it is a mere compilation from very nearly the whole mass of preceding Midrashic literature. We are therefore thrown back to the following conclusion:

* Professor Estlin Carpenter (*The First Three Gospels, their Origin and Relations*) has, on pp. 12-20 (People's 6d. edit. 1909), some interesting paragraphs on the nature of oral traditions in the early Church as well as among the early Rabbis. Stores of accumulated learning were retained in the memory, and passed on in this way from one age to another, there being an aversion to their arrangement in written form.

that the output of Midrashic literature extended from the first century A.D. right down to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; but that after the tenth century, which saw the compilation of the *Pirké De R. Eliezer* and the *Tanna Debe Elijahu*, the products in this field contained little originality, being chiefly reproductions and condensations of preceding teachings.

My survey, then, of what the Rabbins thought and taught about the Immanence of God, embraces no less than ten centuries. The pronouncements I have quoted about the Shechinah and Holy Spirit, are spread over that long distance of time. Can any stages of development be pointed out in this huge and heterogeneous mass of doctrines covering all these centuries? The student of history will say at once, and categorically, "Yes, certainly! development there must have been, and it ought not to be difficult to show it. The investigator could not possibly fail to see it in the course of his work, if he did his work in a methodical and scientific spirit." And, after all, this retort, on the surface, appears a correct and justifiable one. Suppose a student of Christian thought were to compose a treatise dealing with such a subject as the history of Original Sin from A.D. 1 to A.D. 900, would it not be a vital part of his business to deal with the development of the idea from stage to stage, and from century to century? Certainly. It is hard to see how his treatise could claim consideration as a work of science without it. Similarly, a treatise on the Immanence of God in Jewish theology, as thought of and taught during ten centuries, must take account of differences of environment, differences of religious and theological outlook, differences in the constitution of men's minds, which are inseparable from the history of a long stretch of time. Doctrines and dogmas are the

children of circumstances. They are moulded, evolved, transformed under the stress of ever-changing forces. And it is the duty of the historian to watch these variations and evolutions in their successive relations to one another, as well as to the parent idea.

But the effort to give a chronological survey of Jewish thought on the doctrine of Immanence, is beset with peculiar difficulties. It is questionable whether any logically-correct analogy can be instituted, between the history of a theological idea in Rabbinic literature, and the history of the same idea in Christian literature. And for the following reason: Christian theology of any age, is dominated by some pre-eminent teacher who both propagated his own strictly theological views, and also reflected, in his own teachings, the theological views cherished by his people. St. Paul was a great and original thinker. He set a theological standard to his followers. He is also to a large extent the reflexion of what was thought and felt and aspired after, in the theological world of his generation. And so with St. Augustine or Luther, or any other paramount leader. But nothing like this occurs in Rabbinical theology. Its great men are great in Halacha, and not in the elucidation and propagation of theological doctrines. This fact can be seen in two ways.

Firstly, while the development of Halacha went on apace, that of Haggada was practically stagnant. Bacher has pointed out (*Ag-Tan.* i. 451-475; *idem, Ag. Pal. Amor.* i. pp. viii *et seq.*) how there is practically no difference between the Haggada of the Tannaitic and that of the Amoraic age. But what a momentous evolution took place during that time in the Halacha! The final redaction of the Mishna is the great product of this transition. The significance of the Mishna for the Halacha is everything; for the Haggada it is

almost nothing. Again, the activity of the Talmudic authorities, as has been said previously, came to an end in the sixth century with the cessation of the Saboraim. This does not, however, imply that the development of Halacha ceased, or even received a set-back. On the contrary, the epoch of the Geonim followed that of the Saboraim ; and the influence of the Geonim in the field of the development of Halacha was enormous. In vol. v. of his *Geschichte*, Graetz shows how their Halachic expositions set the standard for all the Jewish communities not only in the Mohammedan countries of those days, but also in Christian Europe ; their Responsa, which dealt with ritual and legal questions, swayed the Judaism of the Diaspora. But of the evolution or advancement of the Haggadah during those centuries (*i.e.* down to the eleventh century, the last Gaon of Pumbeditha, Hai, having died in 1038) we know nothing. Moreover, real originality in Midrashic output, ceased even before the tenth century. The high-water mark of Midrashic exegesis was reached in the sixth century ; from the sixth to the tenth century such originality as there was, consisted in revising or collecting, condensing or editing the materials to hand ; no new schools of interpretation were established, no new exegetical methods were devised ; there was nothing that drew the attention, or answered in any way to the changed religious demands, of the Diaspora. Even the Pirké De R. Eliezer or the Tanna Debe Elijahu, although they undoubtedly present features which are absent from their early predecessors, nevertheless do not exhibit any of that richness of development such as we notice in the contemporary Halacha. And their significance for the Judaism of their epoch or succeeding epochs was, in comparison, small.

But secondly, as has already been hinted, the men

who left their mark on the Rabbinic period were primarily *Halachists*. The immortal debt which the Talmud owes to a man like Akiba, rests on his contributions to Halacha, his genius in the systematisation of the floating body of oral laws, his originality in devising new hermeneutical principles for the deduction of certain truths from the words of Scripture, by means of which he gave to the Halacha the possibility of continuous development. Akiba shines too in the sphere of Haggada. But his teachings here are spasmodic and fragmentary. They do not form a system, a philosophy. They were never taken up as a body, and worked upon or developed by succeeding thinkers. The same thing is true of a famous Amora like Rab (Abba Arika, third century A.D.). His disputes with Samuel, his distinguished contemporary, are perhaps the most forcible illustrations we can find, of the Rabbinical dialectic method ; they are most intricate and puzzling ; they are to be found in all quarters of the Talmud. But they are all focussed round the Halacha. Rab was fertile in Haggada too ; but it was only a subsidiary subject with him. Every student of Rabbinics knows of the *Hawayot de-Abayé we-Raba*, i.e. the debates of Abayé (Amora, fourth century A.D.) and Raba (ditto). For the Halacha these knotty disquisitions are of the highest import. They do not touch the Haggada. The philosophical Haggadist, the Amora who first endeavoured to reduce the Rabbinical sayings on ethics and theology to ordered and reasoned system, which would have lent itself to considerable development and ramification at future hands, was Simlaï (third century A.D.). His resolution (see T. B. Makkot 23b, 24a) of the 613 precepts into the one all-embracing fundamental principle of Faith as stated by the prophet Habakkuk, "And the just

shall live by his faith," offered a useful starting-point for a logical and definite study of theology. But it was never taken up. Simlaï is only one among the crowd of Amoraim. He is quite eclipsed by the Halachists.

How true this point of view is, can be seen again from the following consideration. The Incorporeality and the Omniscience of God, His Spirituality, His Providence, the Immortality of the Soul, the Freedom of the Will, Divine Retribution,—all these fundamental principles of Judaism have their fount and origin, after the O.T., in the Rabbinical literature. The Jew who denies *e.g.* the immortality of the soul, is surely contravening Rabbinism as much as the Jew who would eat leavened bread on the eighth day of Passover or sound the Shofar on the New Year's Day which fell on the Sabbath. Yet, while we have a massive literature of Halacha, Responsa, and Codifications dealing with, and developing, these ritual institutions—a literature belonging to both Talmudic and post-Talmudic centuries—the development, elucidation, and attempted systematisation of theological themes had to wait until the rise of the Arabic-Jewish philosophy with Sa'adiah in the tenth century. And even after Sa'adiah, there was no continuous and homogeneous stream of development. Sa'adiah's successors worked out matters independently of him and of one another. Each thinker gave his own individual views. Bahya Ibn Pakuda, Jehuda Ha-Levi, Abraham Ibn David, Maimonides, Gersonides and Hisdai Crescas—all have one, and one only, point of affinity, viz. that they model themselves on their common teacher Aristotle (Ibn Gabriol is throughout a Platonist). In all other respects each man speaks only for himself, decides the theological problem entirely according to his own individual opinion. And so it came about,

that whereas in the early Christian Church we meet with the three authoritative formulæ of faith — the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian — the creeds and dogmas which were drawn up by the mediæval Jewish philosophers had no canonical validity. No ecclesiastical sanctity attached to them which would make them binding upon every Jew. They were only drawn up in the systematic form of Articles of Belief, because of the necessity felt by their authors, of combating the theological attacks made on the citadel of Judaism by the Karaites on the one hand, and by the theories of faith current among the Mohammedans and Christians on the other. The respect shown to them arose out of the religious importance and the intellectual brilliance of their authors. This, of course, meant a great deal ; but it did not mean enough to enable the formulation and fixture of these Articles of Faith to stand on the same level of a binding importance as the contemporaneously-developed principles of the Halacha.

These, then, are the reasons which make the task of showing development of theological ideas during the many centuries covered by the Rabbinic period, not only one of difficulty, but also of dubious worth. For the most potent test of the inmost meaning and truest drift of the literature of any age, is to be found in the interpretation of the life of that age—literature being but the expression of life. No matter what view of things theoretical investigation may afford, if we have reason to think on other grounds that the life of an epoch was different, we must not put too much trust in the investigation of the written word. For our main object after all, is to get at the life not the literature, and in the degree that we oftentimes deduce literature from life, in that degree are we often called upon to deduce life from literature. Now, what do we know about life under the Rabbinic

religion during those far-away centuries? We know, that the life of the orthodox Jew was so ordered by him as to accord with his ingrained belief that "wherever Israel was there the Shechinah was." It was not doubted. It was never controverted (except from outside, as has been previously said). All the Haggadic notions about the Immanence of God were accepted on their face-value. The life of the home, of the synagogue, of the community, was grounded and fashioned on this assumption. To examine too inquisitively into the Divine Nature was, as a matter of fact, sternly reprobated as showing a dangerous want of faith. No one really wanted to know what God was, or what the Shechinah or Holy Spirit were, in their absolute or essential nature. The reality of their existence was experienced in the practical life. This was all, and this was enough. The questioner was the sceptic who refused to toe the line with his brethren and was branded as a heretic. A statement in the opening Mishna of T. B. Haggigah ii. says: "A man who speculates on the four following things, it were better for him had he never entered the world, viz. that which is above and that which is below, that which was formerly and that which is to be." If this remark proves anything at all, it proves that in the Mishnaic epoch religion was a simple affair which brooked no abstract speculations on the mysteries of the Godhead. The few who did pursue these abstractions were the exceptions, in some cases the literary elect. But from our general knowledge of the life during the whole of the Rabbinic period succeeding the Mishna, we may take it that this Mishnaic statement is exactly typical of the popular feeling.

Enough has now been said about the reservations which must be made in any attempt at setting up any

theory of development in the immanental ideas of God during the centuries covered by the present sketch. There are, nevertheless, some apparent instances of development — development which at the time may have escaped consciousness, but which we, reviewing the literature *en masse* at this distance of time, can readily detect.

Firstly, there comes the primitive substratum of immanental teaching in which the Shechinah is materialised. It is material light, fire, cloud, a bird with wings. Quotations have been given showing how the light or fire inflicted real physical injuries. As a material body its movements necessarily create a noise, the *locus classicus* illustrating this being that of T. B. Megillah 29a, where the father of Samuel and Levi (Babylonian Amoraim of the third century) sitting in the synagogue of Shef-Ve-Yatib in Nehardea, hear the noise of the coming of the Shechinah and immediately leave the synagogue, probably out of fright, whereas R. Shesheth (Babylonian Amora of third century) having had the same experience on another occasion is undisturbed by it. These material embodiments of Shechinah are to be found in the later, as well as in the earlier, sections of the literature. But with this difference, viz. whereas in the earlier epochs they were the realised mystical experiences of men, or, as in many instances, the traditions about such experiences which took place in the past, but were afterwards interpreted in a tangible sense, in the later epochs of Rabbinical literature these material terms became rather the symbols for higher spiritualised teachings about Divine Immanence. They were the poetical expression for the spiritual idea rather than the believed-in materialisation of the idea. The Holy Spirit was also materialised in the earlier conceptions, but not to anything like

the same extent as the Shechinah—although on account of the rather frequent loose interchange of the two terms it is difficult to tell the exact amount of materialisation which belongs to each.

Secondly, a development and refinement of the idea is noticeable in the multitudinous statements about God's Shechinah or God's Holy Spirit. The Rabbinic mystic has here reached that stage when he can dissociate, disentangle, the idea of the Deity as the Immanent Power and Love embodied in material phenomena, from the material phenomena themselves. He can e.g. conceive of the Divine immanent justice meting out punishment where necessary, without actually beholding the material agent, such as fire, etc., for the execution of that punishment. And the danger of a degeneration into Pantheism through an identification of the Deity with the world, is avoided by making the Shechinah or Holy Spirit a possession, a kind of emanation of God. It is always "God's Shechinah" or "God's Holy Spirit." It is, in reality, the combination of the transcendent and immanent aspects. The God, active throughout the universe, whose traces are everywhere, and who is so near to man that His answering love can be evoked at all times, is also, at the same time, the God who transcends the world and whose thoughts are not our thoughts, nor His ways our ways.

Thirdly, there is the stage of Personification. It is a passing on from such expressions as *השְׁרָה הַקְבָּח שְׁכִינָה* . . . "God caused His Shechinah to dwell . . ." to those numerous passages where the Shechinah or Holy Spirit speaks, walks, weeps, rejoices, etc. This denotes a decided advance in the Immanent idea. What with all the uncompromising repugnance of the Rabbins to any idea which might in the remotest degree suggest a plurality of persons in the Godhead, the cosmic phase of

the Immanent Deity is nevertheless regarded fearlessly and outspokenly as a person. But let it not be implied that this personification ousted or superseded chronologically the less-developed and earlier usage. The student of Rabbincs knows full well that expressions about Shechinah and Holy Spirit as personifications, are found side by side with expressions, belonging to the very same period of time, which refer to God's Shechinah or God's Holy Spirit. But, anyhow, the idea had developed, even if the mode of speaking about it, had not.

Fourthly, there is, particularly in the case of Holy Spirit, a broadening out of the idea that only certain supremely gifted individuals, such as prophets, possessed in themselves the touch of the Immanent Deity. Instances have been adduced in this treatise to show how the Rabbins occasionally assigned the Holy Spirit to a wider sphere of persons (even to some women), and long after canonical prophecy had come to an end. The prophet was the possessor of the Holy Spirit as well as of the mental and spiritual endowments. Neither of these qualifications by themselves, would have made him a prophet. It was the combination of the two. But many men did make themselves possessors of the Holy Spirit, provided they aimed at that spiritual perfection which is its indispensable preliminary. And all men *can* do so. The same truth is enunciated in another way—and in reference to the Shechinah as well. How can such statements as these, telling us that the Shechinah encompasses every Israelite, be made to tally with the many pronouncements which declare that the Shechinah (or Holy Spirit) only rests upon certain persons who are equipped in certain mental and spiritual and even physical respects? The reply is, that there is a ground-assumption to start with, that the Shechinah or Holy

Spirit is there with every man, but it *does not come to realisation* unless certain requirements are fulfilled. In the one case it is dormant. In the other it is vitally assertive. To possess this vitally-assertive degree of Divine Immanence is within the power of every one who orders his life in pursuit of it. It is an ideal, but always realisable. With such a doctrine to its credit, Rabbinic theology reveals itself as being possessed of a living message. To be Shechinah-possessed is to be no idle dreamer. The nearness of God is realised only in active obedience. Rabbinic mysticism does not merely imply a temperament or a certain attitude towards the speculative problems of religion. It implies a life rich in outward service to all things that constitute the practical demands of religion.

Fifthly, this broadening of the basis of the immanent doctrine has another and even more important phase. I have alluded to numerous passages where the Shechinah is not made to extend outside the Temple or the Synagogue or Palestine, and where both Shechinah and Holy Spirit are only applicable to the Jew, the non-Jew not being thought of as worthy of inclusion in the privilege. On the other hand, I have quoted instances not a few, where the Shechinah is regarded as the common property of the whole world, and where the Holy Spirit may be won by men of all nations. These quotations, it is quite true, are comparatively rare. But the fact that they exist, no matter in how small a measure, shows that to the Rabbinic sages, theology was not merely a matter of nationalism and particularism and nothing else. They too, had very real glimpses of that higher life of direct relationship with God which it is possible for men of all sects and at all times to acquire. The germ of universalist teaching is found in Rabbinic literature, and a germ always develops. The logic of the first centuries,

whether of Judaism or Christianity, was not the same as our logic of to-day—or rather we ought not to judge that logic by the standards we adopt to-day. No one, for argument's sake, would deny that a progressive development took place in the ideas of Christian toleration from the first to the tenth century. And yet what an amount of bloodthirsty intolerance characterised many events within that epoch. Would it then be right to reverse the verdict and say that there could have been no progressive development? By no means. The *idea of progressiveness was there*. It was thought of and taught and emphasised. It was there in germ. But the idea oft received a rude set-back until it blossomed out into its full perfection. Our position is exactly analogous. The claim of Rabbinic theology, that in human fellowship with God “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female” but all can be at one with Him, that claim does not depend for its ultimate justification on the mere arithmetical number of passages which can be adduced in its support. It rests on the fact that there *are* such passages. For once an idea gets a footing, growth and development must inevitably and assuredly follow.

One reason why this development of the universalist doctrine was comparatively stunted, was because the Rabbinic era is the period of history when the Jews were under the Roman rule. A state of tutelage in which the superior power was often the oppressor, could not be expected to generate the highest religious attitude towards that governing power. Moreover, it made the Jew ascribe to the world outside him, a too exaggerated depravity. The many unkindly sentiments against the non-Jew to be found in Talmud and Midrashim, must be assigned to this cause. It must here again

be remembered, that the logic of those early times differed so materially in this respect from ours. And yet, in spite of these adverse conditions, the overflowing of Divine Immanence beyond the national borders of Israel is implied in many Rabbinic sayings, which, though not directly alluding to the subject of immanence, have a strong kinship with it. How otherwise could we account for such a statement as that of T. B. Sukkah 55a? "With what object are these seventy bullocks sacrificed [on the Feast of Tabernacles]?" With the object of atoning for the sins of the seventy nations." The altar and the sacrifice were, in ancient Israel, the visible symbol of the "nearness" of God to Israel. Yet here the nations participate in this "nearness." The poetry of this teaching is nowhere better given than in T. B. Megillah 10b where an imaginative legend portrays a Divine rebuke to the angelic hosts about to sing a pæan of triumph over the overthrow of the Egyptians at the Red Sea: "The works of my hands are sinking in the sea, and will ye sing a song before me?" This Rabbinic delineation of the arch-enemy of the Jew as the work of God's hands, and therefore an object of His pitying concern, is a model instance of the freest, widest, and most tolerant standpoint in religious philosophy. The Yalkut on ל' ר', quoting from one of the latest Midrashim, to which allusion has been made in a previous page—the Tanna Debe Elijah—remarks: "God said unto Moses, 'Is there any respecting of persons with me?' Verily, be he Israelite, or be he Gentile, if he perform a precept there is a recompense [for him] beside it." A developed form of this doctrine is summarised by Maimonides as follows: "Every man whatsoever of all who enter the world, whose spirit hath prompted him, and endowed him with the knowledge, how to separate himself to stand

before God to minister unto Him, and to work in order to know God and to walk in that uprightness in which God made him, truly such a man is sacrosanct (*שָׁמַרְנָא*), he is a Holy of Holies; and God shall be his portion and his inheritance for ever and unto all eternity" (Maimonides, *Yad Ha-Hazaka*, Rules of *וַיִּגְלֹת* *הַשְׁׁמֶן*, xiii. 3). Maimonides' pronouncement is no exotic, neither is it the mere personal expression of his own independent point of view bearing no relation to his predecessors in thought. It is the natural outcome of the Rabbinic inheritance which had come down to him, and which he, by the help of his genius, retailed to his own time in the spirit and with the interpretation that suited it. Maimonides has added nothing which was not already there, at least in germ.

That these ideas about religion as being a universal, and not a national or local, thing should find strong root in the literature under consideration, is not really strange, for the Pharisees, the Halachists, and the Haggadists were the lineal successors of the great prophets of Israel who flourished in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. The Rabbins certainly imported a large amount of legalism into the inherited prophetic religion. But this did not imply that in inculcating legalism they forgot spirituality. It is wrong to think, as is often thought, that there is a necessary antagonism between the two. The prophet whose ideas the Rabbins seem to have most faithfully reflected is Jeremiah. Jeremiah's message strikes the note of downheartedness and depression. But there is an intermingling of the most cheery optimism. He does not think that punishment is God's last word to Israel. He is a man of hope. He foresees a happy time for the exiles. And this happy time he depicts in a passage which contains the sublimated essence of his religious teaching. This

passage occurs in chap. xxxi. 31-34, where he speaks of the New Covenant. In the days to come, God will replace the Old Covenant, made at the exodus from Egypt, by a new one, which will be this: that He will put His law in the inward parts of the Israelites, and write it in their hearts; He will be their God, and they will be His people. There will be no longer any need for them to teach one another to know God. The covenant being engraven indelibly on their souls, they will all know God of themselves, without any outward instruction, from the least of them to the greatest of them. And, as a necessary consequence, sin and iniquity will be forgiven and forgotten. The leading ideas in this familiar passage are:—(a) Religion is a thing of the heart, obedience to an inward rather than an outward prompting. (b) Religion is an individual matter, a relation between an individual soul and its maker. (c) If religion is individualist through the truth of God being immanent in every heart, then it is easy to see how it can transcend any one community or nation, and become the property of many nations and communities. In fine, there can be a religion of humanity.

The large variety of mystical teachings which exist in the Rabbinical literature proves, that Rabbinical Judaism possesses most intensely human and most broadly spiritual tendencies. But there is another factor to be noted. Rabbinical Judaism is an amalgam of a Jeremiah and an Ezekiel. Ezekiel's ideal was that of a restored Israel in which the priestly ordinances, the legalism and ceremonialism of Judaism, would have full sway. Religion was a communal affair, to which the individual owes an outward allegiance. Jeremiah's ideal was that of every soul having its own intimate intercourse with God. Resting

on this twofold anchorage, Rabbinical Judaism was saved from destruction. Its outwardness and its inwardness were both necessary to its preservation. Each corrected and supplemented the other. Modern Judaism depends for its possibilities of future development upon the correctly proportionated blending of these two necessary tendencies.

APPENDIX I

ON THE INTERCHANGING OF THE TERMS "SHECHINAH" AND "RUAH HA-KODESH"

My exposition of the different senses in which these two terms are used throughout the Rabbinical literature will have shown that although they are far from being synonymous, they yet bear a strong affinity to one another. Under the circumstances, it is therefore not surprising to find them employed interchangeably in many instances. Often what is said in one place about the Shechinah is said in some other place about the Holy Spirit. Similar phraseology clusters round them both in many passages. The following is a classified list of some of the more prominent of these interchanges:—

(a) *As material object.* In T. B. *Soṭah* 9b when the Shechinah rests on Samson his hairs stand up and knock against one another with the sound of a bell. In *Lev. Rabba* viii. 2 the same is said when the Holy Spirit rests upon him.

I have given instances of the materialisation of Shechinah as light or fire. In *Lev. Rabba* i. 1 the same material idea is used in describing the Holy Spirit, when we are told that "at the time when the Holy Spirit rested on Phinehas his face burned like a torch." In fact, the same expression רצ'ה (possibly connected with נזרקה = a spark) is occasionally used of both.

In T. B. *Yoma* 21a and 52b the Shechinah is one among the five things wanting in the second Temple. In *Song of Songs Rabba* viii. 3, *Numbers Rabba* xv. 10 it is the Holy Spirit that is wanting, not the Shechinah.

(b) *Personification.* Both Shechinah and Holy Spirit

are at times (1) אומרת, “saying”; (2) צוחחת, “crying”; (3) טיללה, “lamenting”; (4) משיבה = answering.

(c) *Prophecy.* The close connexion between Holy Spirit and Prophecy has been indicated. In Koheleth Rabba i. 2 Amos is said to have become a prophet, because God placed His Shechinah upon him (ולא השורה שנינחה אלא על חזון קשיש).

In Yalqut on Jonah i. there is a sentence distinctly conveying the idea of the identity of Shechinah and Holy Spirit as follows: יונח בן אמיתי מעולג וגלם הדת... ושורתה עליו רוח הקודש ללמדך שאין החנינה שורה אלא על לב שמה. Here prophecy is clearly as much a result of the Shechinah as of the Holy Spirit. In T. B. Pesahim 117a David's inspiration for the composition of a certain Psalm comes from the Shechinah. (Cp. also T. B. Yoma 71a.)

(d) Illustrations have been given, of the *opposition between Shechinah and Sin.* In Tanhuma on בחקותי (and other parallel places) Phinehas loses his Holy Spirit by reason of his sin in connexion with Jephthah's daughter (see T. B. Ta'anith 4a).

(e) *As the Ideal.* In Deuteronomy Rabba vi. 14 God takes away His Shechinah from the Israelites by reason of their sin, but in the time to come, when the heart of flesh shall have been substituted for the heart of stone, His Shechinah will again come back. The proof for this is taken from Joel ii. 28, 29, the great “*Spirit*” passages.

In Leviticus Rabba xxxv. 7 the student of the Torah is said to be “worthy of receiving the Holy Spirit.” The word “receiving” in connexion with the Shechinah is most common, as has been shown. And the idea that the study of the Torah is the means of bringing about the mystical union between man and God implied in the term “Shechinah” is to be found constantly in Talmud and Midrash. The immanence of God is the *ideal* in so far as it represents the realised consciousness of union with God. This can only be brought about by a life of devotion to the Torah. The immanence of God is real in so far as it exists in every man, but is constantly thwarted by man's perversity. It is there, but unrealised.

The well-known passages in Mechilta בשלח on the

idealism of faith are, in the Mechilta (as in the Tanhuma parallel passage), associated with the Holy Spirit. Thus, "Great is the faith with which the Israelites believed in Him who spake and the world was, and as a reward for their faith, the Holy Spirit rested upon them and they sang a song." But the parallel passage in Exodus Rabba xxi. 13 gives, as their reward, the fact that "the Shechinah rested upon them."

The Yalkut on Jeremiah x. says, with a worthy universalism, "causing the Holy Spirit to dwell upon mankind." But this can be easily paralleled by the many passages where the Shechinah is spoken of as dwelling among the *תְּהִתְנוּם*, earthly inhabitants in the broad sense. (See e.g. Numbers Rabba xii. 6; Tanhuma on פָּקָדֵי.)

Hence the following deductions seem to be possible:—

(1) That the two terms, having so much in common, are oftentimes used indiscriminately.

(2) That the term "Holy Spirit" is used far more sparingly in Rabbinical literature than "Shechinah." Whether this is owing to the adoption of Holy Spirit into the theology of the N.T. and the Church Fathers, is a moot point.

(3) That where Holy Spirit is used as a parallel to Shechinah, it is mostly to be found in the *later* rather than in the earlier Rabbinical literature. This may possibly be accounted for by the suggestion that the earlier Tannaitic Midrashim, like Sifra, Sifre, Mechilta, as well as the teachings of the Tannaim and Amoraim to be found in the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, were contemporaneous with the opening centuries of Christianity, when the ideas of Holy Spirit in the Christian sense were making great inroads among many people. The Jews would accordingly be loath to use an expression, which might further popularise anything connected with Christianity. The later Midrashim, however, belong to a period when the breach between Judaism and Christianity was a long-accomplished fact, and all controversy had long been silenced. Hence the Rabbins and the people had nothing to fear from a free and open usage of such an expression as Holy Spirit. But the matter is really one that calls for further investigation.

APPENDIX II

ON THE CONNEXION BETWEEN "KABOD" (GLORY) AND SHECHINAH

INSTANCES are found where "Kabod" ("Glory") is the synonym for Shechinah. But they are comparatively rare. The N.T. Greek equivalent for both words is δόξα, which, though always translated "Glory," covers many of the meanings implied in Shechinah. Thus, to mention only one instance, in Acts xxii. 11, St. Paul tells of his experiences on the road to Damascus, and speaks of his perception of the risen Christ as "the glory of that light" (*ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου*). Here glory is undoubtedly materialised. It is a body of light that Paul is talking about, as if it were a substance that surrounds and penetrates him through and through. It has been shown how Shechinah possesses a series of mystical ideas like these of light. The favourite figure by which Kabod is materially represented is that of a cloud. Thus Yalkut on Song of Songs ii., alluding to the verse in Song of Songs ii. 6, says: "These are the clouds of [Kabod] Glory which surround Israel from top to bottom." Instead of being bathed in a body of mystical light, as the Shechinah idea implies, Israel is bathed in a mystical body of cloud. In the ideal sense, associated with the future, there is a passage in Tanhuma on פָּנָים which is couched in a similar phraseology to that which often characterises Shechinah and Holy Spirit. It is as follows: "God will in the future make for every saint a canopy out of the clouds of glory, as it is said. . . ." The idea of מִזְרָח (concentration of Divinity in one small spot)

which plays a large part in connexion with Shechinah, also plays a part in connexion with "Kabod." See Yalkut on Job xxiii. xxxviii.; also Sifra (edit. Weiss), p. 4 (where such expressions are used as "not seeing the Kabod"). An instance of a Halachic law derived from the mystical nature of "Kabod" is that of T. B. Kiddushin 31a, where R. Joshua b. Levi prohibits the walking of four cubits with pride because God's glory fills the whole world; and its identity with Shechinah is proved from the statement which immediately follows, where R. Huna says that he never walked four cubits with uncovered head because the Shechinah was above his head. See Midrash Tillim on Psalm xc. for another description of the immanence of the "Kabod" based on the words "He shall abide in the shadow of the Almighty." The interchange of Kabod and "Shechinah" is obvious in Tanhuma on במדבר, where the phrase occurs ענן דשכינהה, "the cloud of the Shechinah" (cloud being the usual metaphor for "Kabod" and not for Shechinah). In Tanhuma on עקב, where the legend is given of how Moses, on the eve of the Israelites' departure from Egypt, tries to identify the coffin of Joseph, there occurs the phrase: "The Shechinah is keeping back; Israel and the clouds of Kabod are keeping back for thee." Obviously a parallelism is here intended; further on in the same passage of Tanhuma, there is a description of the coming time when "Israel shall see God in His Kabod," which tallies with the many passages where Shechinah and Holy Spirit are spoken of in an exactly similar sense.

But if the "Kabod" has been largely eclipsed in the Talmudic and Midrashic branch of Rabbinics by the "Shechinah," it has maintained itself unimpaired in the Targumic branch. Here it appears as "Yekara." The Yekara is used in two ways: (1) as the equivalent Aramaic word for "Kabod," as e.g. in Leviticus ix. 23, where the verse "and the glory of the Lord appeared," is rendered זה יקרא דה; (2) as a parallel to some (though not all) of the meanings of "Memra," to denote the Divine immanent activity in the universe and man. Examples of this are: Genesis xxviii. 13, where the phrase "and, behold, the Lord stood above it," is rendered, "and, behold, the Yekara . . . stood above it";

Genesis xvii. 22, "and God went up from Abraham," is rendered, "and the Yekara . . . went up." Again, Genesis xviii. 33, "and the Lord went," is rendered, "and the Yekara . . . departed." In Exodus xxxiii. 23 the words "and I will take away my hand," are rendered וְאַעֲדֵי יְהוָה דְּבָרָתִי קָרְבָּן, although in the preceding sentence the same word נֶפֶשׁ is rendered by "my Memra." This would seem to prove that Yekara and Memra are to an extent synonymous. The exact relations between the two, is a matter for further research. So also are the relations between "Yekara" and "Shechinta" of the Targum. "Shechinta" is found occasionally, as e.g. Exodus xxxiv. 9, which is rendered by Onkelos, "Let the Shechinta of God go among us." In Deut. xii. 5, Onkelos renders the Hebrew for "to put His Name there," by "to cause His Shechinta to dwell there." In the Exodus passage just alluded to, it is hard to see why "Shechinta" should be used, seeing that in Genesis xviii. 33 the Tetragrammaton in conjunction with the very same verb (וַיַּלְכֵל) is rendered by "Yekara." Obviously there is a degree of synonymy again between these two terms. To sum up the matter, both "Yekara" and "Shechinta" would seem to be terms which at times denote the same idea and at times denote different ideas. Both terms seem to denote aspects of the teaching covered by the larger and more comprehensive term "Memra."

INDEX OF BIBLICAL AND RABBINICAL PASSAGES QUOTED

A. OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis i. 2. 49, 175, 188, 217; i. 4. 171; i. 5. 137; i. 26. 75; i. 28. 137; i. 31. 314; ii. 7. 20, 75, 189, 202; ii. 8. 162; ii. 9. 189; ii. 11. 14. 74; ii. 19. 202; iii. 8. 154, 218; iii. 9. 64; iii. 16-17. 137; vi. 3. 189; vi. 6. 158; vi. 17. 188; vii. 15. 176, 188; viii. 16. 154; viii. 21. 158, 168; ix. 9. 21; ix. 16-17. 152; x. 25. 258; xi. 29. 215; xii. 5. 90; xv. 1. 154; xv. 6. 154; xvii. 22. 171, 382; xviii. 2. 257; xviii. 33. 382; xx. 3. 158; xxii. 16. 158; xxiv. 3. 158; xxvi. 10. 171; xxvii. 42. 261; xxviii. 1. 262; xxviii. 10. 167; xxviii. 13. 171, 381; xxviii. 20-21. 154; xxix. 2. 262; xxx. 23. 158; xxxi. 49-50. 152; xxxii. 30. 46; xxxv. 3. 154; xxxvii. 33. 263; xli. 8. 176; xl. 29. 216; xl. 21. 168; xl. 27. 250, 270; xlvi. 4. 73, 151, 168, 169; xlvi. 16. 129.

Exodus i. 12. 58; ii. 23-24. 324; iii. 2-6. 74; iii. 12. 154; iii. 14. 46; iii. 15. 47, 74, 170; iv. 12. 154; iv. 22. 54; v. 14. 273; vi. 9. 176; vii. 1. 238, 239; ix. 16. 47, 74; xii. 29. 154; xiii. 21. 134; xiv. 31. 151, 154; xv. 22. 141; xvi. 6. 87; xvi. 8. 152, 155; xvi. 20. 116; xvi. 25. 88; xvii. 7. 79; xix. 3. 296; xix. 17. 155; xix. 18. 79; xix. 20. 296; xx. 1. 155; xxi. 22. 337; xxiii. 20. 96; xxv. 22. 155; xxvi. 28. 264; xxviii. 3. 177; xxxi. 3. 180; xxxi. 17. 152; xxxi. 18. 151, 168; xxxii. 229; xxxii. 13. 158; xxxii. 35. 158; xxxiii. 11. 167; xxxiii. 14. 96, 170; xxxiii. 20. 95; xxxiii. 22. 57, 171; xxxiii. 23. 382;

xxxiv. 6. 60; xxxiv. 9. 382; xxxiv. 29. 84; xl. 34-38. 93

Leviticus v. 21. 155; vii. 10. 234; ix. 23. 381; ix. 24. 83; xvi. 2. 171; xvi. 16. 139; xvii. 11. 21; xx. 23. 156; xxiv. 10-12. 215; xxvi. 12. 66; xxvi. 30. 158; xxvi. 46. 156

Numbers iv. 18. 105; v. 3. 79; v. 12. 116; v. 14. 178; vi. 25. 83; vii. 89. 40, 167; x. 33-34. 171; x. 35. 96, 156; x. 36. 93; xi. 12. 286; xi. 16. 194, 203, 273; xi. 17. 181; xiv. 9. 11. 156; xiv. 24. 177; xiv. 30. 158; xv. 31. 170; xxiii. 1. 233; xxiii. 4. 234; xxiii. 8. 21. 156; xxiv. 2. 184; xxiv. 6. 79; xxvii. 14. 193, 194; xxvii. 16. 178

Deuteronomy i. 30. 157; i. 31. 236; i. 32. 157; ii. 18. 167; ii. 30. 177; iii. 23. 324; iv. 7. 181; iv. 83. 157; iv. 84. 152; iv. 86. 157; v. 11. 21. 35. 157; ix. 3. 158; ix. 18. 324; xi. 12. 152; xii. 5. 382; xx. 12. 19. 36; xxi. 8. 168; xxi. 20. 168; xxiii. 14. 49, 60, 115, 297; xxix. 20. 242; xxx. 3. 127; xxx. 11-14. 50; xxxi. 3. 169; xxxii. 275; xxxii. 11. 236; xxxiii. 5. 339; xxxiii. 7. 157-159; xxxiv. 6. 116; xxxiv. 10. 277

Joshua i. 8. 273; v. 14. 129; xiii. 22. 184

Judges v. 4. 5. 44; v. 31. 227; xiii. 18. 46; xiii. 22. 99; xiii. 25. 98, 180; xiv. 6. 180; xv. 14. 180

1 Samuel i. 28. 265; ii. 25. 142; ii. 27. 127; x. 6. 180; x. 10. 239; xi. 6. 180; xv. 11. 171; xvi. 18. 180; xvi. 23. 178; xvii. 10. 178; xix. 20. 239; xix. 24. 240; xxv. 29. 102

2 Samuel xv. 268; xx. 22. 265

1 Kings vi. 1. 85; viii. 28. 325; viii.

50. 170; viii. 65. 233; viii. 66. 86; ix. 3. 119, 120, 122; xiv. 9. 339; xvii. 1. 134; xix. 11. 219; xx. 1. 36
- 2 Kings ii. 7. 16. 266
- Isaiah i. 2. 170; i. 4. 158; i. 16. 170; ii. 2. 248; ii. 22. 43; iii. 8. 198; vi. 25. 95; vi. 8. 170; xi. 2. 177, 185, 205; xii. 2. 185; xx. 2. 256; xxv. 8. 95; xxvi. 19. 203; xxviii. 5. 88; xxix. 3. 36; xxix. 10. 178; xxx. 33. 162; xxxv. 1. 96; xxxv. 2. 44; xxxix. 16. 191; xl. 22. 18. 47; xlii. 1-4. 186; xlvi. 5. 48; xlvi. 6. 54; xlvi. 14. 127; xlvi. 3. 181; lxi. 12. 43; lxii. 12. 107; lv. 6. 142; lv. 8. 47; lvi. 7. 122; lvii. 15. 50; lvii. 16. 48, 192; lviii. 13. 350; lix. 21. 186; lxiii. 9. 196, 236, 50; lxii. 10-11. 174, 193, 194, 195, 196, 205; lxiii. 11. 53; lxiii. 14. 156, 170; lxiv. 7. 53; lxvi. 1. 25
- Jeremiah i. 5. 235; v. 13. 149; vii. 16. 324; xiii. 16. 106; xvii. 12. 124; xxiii. 24. 40; xxxi. 9. 53; xxxi. 19. 54; xxxi. 31-34. 371; xxxvii. 5. 79; xxxix. 18. 170; xl. 2-5. 247; xlvi. 11. 170
- Ezekiel i. 1. 202; i. 26. 28. 252; ii. 2. 182; iii. 12. 169, 182, 217; iii. 14. 182; iii. 26. 10; viii. 3. 182, 256; x. 4. 116; xi. 1. 24. 182; xvi. 14. 86; xviii. 31. 43; xvii. 32. 142; xx. 3. 142; xx. 5. 158; xxi. 2. 289; xxiii. 18. 158; xxxvi. 17. 139; xxxvi. 26. 43; xxxvii. 203; xxxvii. 1-14. 181; xxxvii. 27. 28. 80; xlvi. 2. 82
- Hosea iv. 1-2. 304; v. 4. 176; v. 7. 170; v. 15. 106; vi. 7. 170; ix. 10. 156; xi. 1. 235; xi. 3. 235; xi. 4. 157; xii. 2. 177
- Joel ii. 28. 194; ii. 28. 29. 378; iii. 1. 2. 274
- Amos. iii. 2. 28; vii. 16. 239; ix. 2-4. 124; ix. 11. 80
- Obadiah i. 21. 388
- Jonah i. 3. 124
- Micah ii. 6. 239; iv. 7. 338
- Habakkuk ii. 20. 124; iii. 4. 84
- Zechariah ii. 3. 108; ii. 6. 90; iii. 9. 187; iv. 2. 188; iv. 6. 187, 188; iv. 10. 119, 124; viii. 23. 180; ix. 1. 317; xii. 1. 202; xii. 2. 10. 178; xiv. 9. 338
- Malachi ii. 10. 54
- Psalms i. 69; ii. 47; ii. 7. 8. 164; iii. 4. 120; v. 4. 137; xi. 4. 120, 124; xvi. 8. 79, 829; xvi. 10. 11. 99; xviii. 6. 324; xviii. 8. 247; xix. 1. 44; xxii. 1. 271; xxvii. 29. 186; xxix. 4. 111; xxix. 7. 147; xxx. 1-3. 232; xxxi. 5. 202; xxxii. 6. 76, 147, 191; xxxiii. 9. 153, 162; xxxiv. 7. 128; xxxiv. 18. 201; xxxvi. 9. 171; xli. 4. 59; xlvi. 10. 79; i. 9. 79; li. 11. 53, 174, 198, 196, 201; li. 12. 43, 197; lvi. 11. 70; lxiii. 8. 3; lxv. 2. 79, 110, 141, 237; lxv. 13. 193; lxvii. 17. 162; lxiii. 6. 193; lxxiv. 1. 242; lxxiv. 2. 171; lxxvii. 19. 44; lxxviii. 25. 87; lxxviii. 39. 176, 190; lxxx. 4. 242; lxxx. 17. 164; lxxxii. 9. 143; lxxxii. 1. 122; lxxxix. 14. 110; lxxxix. 15. 44; xc. 1. 109, 288; xc. 2. 3. 162; xcii. 2. 162; ciii. 10. 192; ciii. 13. 53, 192; ciii. 14. 192; ciii. 19. 119; civ. 4. 89, 175; cvi. 30. 324; cvi. 38. 119; cx. 1. 97; cxix. 79. 197; cxxxv. 13. 47, 74; cxxxix. 53; cxxxix. 3. 44; cxxxix. 5. 36; cxxxix. 7-10. 49; cxxxix. 7-12. 44; cxli. 2. 265; cxlii. 10. 184; cxlv. 9. 299, 301; cxlv. 13. 388; cxlviii. 8. 380
- Proverbs iii. 12. 44; iii. 34. 313; viii. 205; viii. 22. 162, 199; viii. 22. 26. 200; viii. 26. 171; viii. 30. 199; viii. 34. 123; xv. 3. 124; xv. 17. 234; xvii. 1. 234; xx. 27. 21, 43; xxi. 28. 228; xxiii. 29. 30. 227; xxv. 21. 143; xxv. 28. 176
- Job xi. 7. 8. 48; xii. 10. 176; xiii. 8. 9. 48; xxvi. 7. 44; xxvi. 9. 86; xxvi. 11. 44; xxvi. 14. 44, 381; xxviii. 25. 220; xxii. 8. 21, 48, 50; xxxiv. 22. 124; xxxv. 5-7. 48; xxxvi. 26. 48; xxxviii. 1. 219
- Canticles i. 2. 144; i. 13. 94; ii. 6. 380; ii. 9. 120; ii. 12. 220; vi. 4. 93; viii. 12. 71; viii. 13. 229; viii. 14. 230
- Ruth ii. 8. 9. 220
- Lamentations i. 1. 71; i. 16. 228; iii. 33. 44; iii. 37. 237; iii. 41. 122; iii. 44. 142
- Ecclesiastes i. 14. 177; iii. 15. 114, 116; iv. 2. 237; v. 2. 48; ix. 7. 238; ix. 11. 169; x. 8. 71; xii. 7. 21, 48, 179
- Daniel iv. 34. 338; ix. 14. 141; xii. 2. 203; xii. 10. 169
- Ezra i. 1. 177; i. 3. 120; i. 5. 48; vi. 9. 187; viii. 15. 95
- Nehemiah viii. 3. 203; ix. 20. 202
- 1 Chronicles xii. 18. 183; xxii. 9. 54
- 2 Chronicles ii. 1. 252; vi. 42. 227; vii. 8. 9. 237; xv. 1-7. 183; xviii. 22. 178; xxxvi. 22. 177

INDEX

385

B. NEW TESTAMENT

- Matthew iii. 11. 16. 220; xviii. 20. 132,
230
Mark i. 10. 220
Luke ii. 9. 57; iii. 5. 202; iii. 22. 220;
xiv. 14. 202; xx. 35. 202
John i. 1. 76, 161; i. 14. 80, 162; iii.
34. 223; v. 29. 202; vi. 29-46.
165; viii. 12. 83; viii. 58. 163;
xiv. 2. 165; xv. 8-10. 165
Acts ii. 2. 206, 132; ii. 3. 132, 221,
222; ii. 4. 221, 132; ii. 42. 131;
vii. 51. 53, 193, 194; xv. 16. 80;
xxii. 11. 222, 380; xxiv. 15. 203;
xxviii. 25. 26. 287
Romans vi. 12-14. 142; vii. 18. 24. 42;
vii. 22. 23. 142; viii. 4-13. 142;
x. 12. 298; xi. 36. 160
1 Corinthians v. 4. 132; viii. 6. 76; x.
16-17. 182; xii. 14-26. 181; xv.
45. 160
2 Corinthians iii. 17. 222; iv. 4. 76;
iv. 6. 57
Ephesians i. 6. 57; iv. 10. etc., 76; iv.
30. 53, 193
Colossians i. 15. 76, 160; i. 16. 76; i.
17. 160; iii. 11. 160
Hebrews viii. 2. 80; x. 15. 16. 287; xi.
274
Revelation i. 4. 162; iv. 5. 89, 162;
vi. 6. 163; vii. 3. 113; xx. 5. 203;
xxi. 3. 80

C. APOCRYPHA

- Wisdom of Solomon i. 4. 59; i. 4-5.
159; ii. 24. 281; vii. 7. 58; vii.
22. 204; vii. 24-26. 78; vii. 25.
59; vii. 29. 30. 78; viii. 1. 73; ix.
15. 42; x. 59; x. 1. 58; x. 19.
159; xv. 2. 59; xvi. 12. 26, 159;
xviii. 14-16. 60
Ecclesiasticus iii. 21. 22. 73; vii. 14.
48; xvii. 10. 132; xxiv. 56; xxxv.
17. 125; xlvi. 10. 132
Tobit iii. 2. 132; viii. 5. 182; xi. 14.
182; xiii. 18. 182; xiv. 9. 132

D. APOCALYPTIC WRITINGS

- 4 Esdras iii. 21. 281; iv. 25. 132; x.
22. 132
Enoch xiv. 9. 163
Secrets of Enoch (edit. Charles, p. 4),
163

E. PHILO

- On Giants, 819
Who is the Heir, etc.? 75, 76, 256

- Allegories of the Sacred Laws, 74, 75
Life of Moses, 74, 76
On the Unchangeableness of God, 74
On the Creation of the World, 74, 75
The Worse plotting against the Better,
75
On Dreams sent by God, 75
On Fugitives, 75
On the Confusion of Languages, 75

F. TARGUM

- Genesis i. 2. 175; vi. 6. 158; (Jerus.)
vi. 6. 158; viii. 21. 168; xvii. 22.
171; xxvi. 10. 171; (Ps. Jon.)
xxviii. 10. 167; xxviii. 18. 171;
(Ps. Jon.) xxviii. 18. 171; xl. 25.
27. 250; (Ps. Jon.) lxii. 23. 29.
171
Exodus (Ps. Jon.) iv. 12. 154; (Ps.
Jon.) xiv. 31. 154; (Ps. Jon.) xix.
17. 155; vii. 7. 79; (Jerus.) xix.
18. 79; xx. 1. 155; (Ps. Jon.) xx.
1. 155; (Jerus.) xx. i. 155; (Ps.
Jon.) xxviii. 30. 263; (Jerus.) xxxii.
35. 158; (Ps. Jon.) xxxiii. 22. 57,
155; xxxiv. 9. 382
Leviticus (Ps. Jon.) v. 21. 155; (Ps.
Jon.) xvi. 2. 171; xx. 28. 156
Numbers v. 3. 79; x. 33. 34. 171; (Ps.
Jon.) x. 35. 156; (Jerus.) x. 35.
156; (Ps. Jon.) xiv. 14. 171; xv.
31. 170; (Ps. Jon.) xxiv. 2. 185;
(Jerus.) xxiv. 6. 79; (Ps. Jon.)
xxvii. 16. 178
Deuteronomy (Ps. Jon.) v. 11. 157; (Ps.
Jon.) v. 21. 157; (Ps. Jon.) ix. 3.
158; xi. 12. 152; xii. 5. 382; xxi.
8. 168; (Jerus.) xxxiii. 7. 157
Judges xiii. 25. 180
1 Kings xviii. 50. 170; vi. 1. 85
Isaiah i. 2. 16. 170; vi. 8. 170; xi. 2.
248; xii. 2. 185; xl. 1. 186; lxiii.
10. 11. 194
Jeremiah xxxix. 18. 170; xl. 11. 170
Hosea v. 5. 170; vi. 7. 170
Psalms i. 9. 79; xvi. 8. 79; (Ps. Jon.)
lxx. 2. 79
Canticles ii. 20. 220
Lamentations i. 1. 71
Koheleth x. 8. 71

G. MISHNA

- Aboth i. 357; ii. 18. 328; iii. 15. 313;
v. 1. 149; v. 203
Berachoth vi. 338; ix. 315; ix. 1. 303
Haggigah ii. 366
Sanhedrin x. 348; xi. 348
Sotah ix. 15. 271

H. TALMUD JERUSHALMI

Berachoth הָרְכָת הַיּוֹם, 137; בְּרִכָּה שְׁמָנָה, 134
 Ta'anith i. 134; ii. 131
 Sukkah iv. 134
 Schebiith ix. 267
 Sanhedrin vi. 265
 Aboda Zarah i. 259
 Soṭah i. 251

I. TOSEFTA

Yadaim ii. 14, 209

K. TALMUD BABLI

Berachoth, 5a. 315, 320; 6a. 115, 125, 144, 145; 7a. 70; 10a. 109; 13a and b. 327; 14b. 346; 15a. 346; 16b. 308, 333; 17a. 333; 23b. 363; 24a. 363; 27b. 141; 29b. 328, 335; 30b. 327; 31a. 333; 32b. 337; 33b. 313; 34b. 267, 320, 328; 43b. 74; 61a. 102; 64a. 97, 98, 145
 Sabbath, 7b. 132; 10a. 116; 12b. 59; 22b. 82; 3a. 287; 87b. 118; 88a. 86; 88b. 110; 92a. 249; 104a. 313; 105b. 143; 127a. 102, 280; 152b. 110
 Erubin 18a. 102; 64a. 259
 Pesahim 5a. 97; 54a. 44, 76, 162, 317; 319; 117a. 378
 Rosh Hashana, 16a. 45; 16b. 163; 17b. 60; 31a. 106, 116
 Ta'anith 2a. 327; 4a. 270, 378; 10a. 172; 11a. 269; 22b. 269; 25b. 267
 Yoma 21a. 377; 21b. 267; 22b. 270; 23a. 172, 197; 36a. 317; 39b. 267, 295; 52b. 377; 71a. 346, 378; 71b. 263, 346; 73b. 155, 263; 75b. 87
 Sukkah 28a. 167; 45b. 99; 48a. 267; 52a. 164, 309, 320; 52b. 143; 55a. 372
 Megillah 3a. 167; 7a. 209; 10b. 372; 12a. 58; 14a. 215; 14b. 265; 20a. 338; 21b. 149; 29a. 18, 59, 97, 127
 Ketuboth, 105b. 346
 Kiddushin 31a. 112, 136, 302, 381; 32b. 44; 69b. 95
 Nedaram 39b. 171, 317; 58a. 249
 Gittin 56a. 339; 56b. 42
 Soṭah 3b. 59; 5a. 104; 9b. 93, 116, 218, 377; 11a. 58; 13a. 262; 14a. 116; 15a. 107; 30b. 59; 38a. 172; 42b. 102; 46a. 168; 49a. 85; 49b. 259
 Baba Bathra, 15a. 210, 211, 221; 16a. 308; 25a. 108; 121a. 222; 121b. 167; 122a. 268; 134a. 167

Sanhedrin, 11a. 267; 16a. 263; 22b. 329, 351; 39a. 73, 108; 46a. 104; 58b. 138; 60a. 171; 64b. 170; 89a. 256; 90b. 42; 91a. 42; 99a. 348; 103a. 98, 102; 103b. 102; 107a. 237

Abodah Zarah, 3b. 172, 349; 5a. 193; 11a. 42; 20b. 271; 22b. 281; 26a. 277

Menahoth 43b. 351; 86b. 82, 83; 110a. 346

Hullin 31a. 338; 31b. 338; 60a. 74, 172

Niddah 13a. 193; 69b. 75
 Abot De R. Nathan ii. 57, 82; xii. 91; xxi. 339; xxx. 270; xxxiv. 106, 141, 248; xxxvi. 115; xli. 102

Makkoth, 11a. 155; 23a. 216; 23b. 363; 24a. 363

Haggigah 12a. 58, 175; 12b. 110; 13a. 110, 213; 14a. 148, 167; 14b. 303; 15a. 219; 15b. 104; 16b. 74

Yebamoth 62a. 193; 64a. 386; 105b. 122, 125

Moed Katan 9a. 86, 237

Betsa 16a. 350

Zebahim 116a. 86

L. MIDRASHIM

Genesis Rabba i. 76, 349; i. 3. 171; iii. 6. 74; iii. 9. 118; iv. 4. 40; iv. 5. 95; vii. 1. 44; viii. 1. 171; viii. 2. 73; viii. 3. 4. 68; viii. 4. 76; viii. 13. 113; ix. 7. 314; xi. 63; xi. 9. 291; xi. 11. 118; xii. 1. 331; xii. 2. 147; xvii. 1. 147; xxvi. 6. 203; xxx. 12. 42; xxxiii. 3. 301; xxxvii. 7. 258; xxxix. 14. 91; xl. 5. 103; xlvi. 2. 290; xlvi. 8. 164; xlvi. 6. 104; xlvi. 9. 105, 115; xlvi. 2. 44; xlvi. 3. 103; lx. 3. 270; lxv. 2. 114; lxviii. 3. 4. 116; lxviii. 4. 114; lxviii. 9. 109; lxx. 9. 220; lxx. 12. 262; lxxv. 8. 262; lxxvii. 1. 114; lxxxiii. 89; lxxxiv. 4. 91; lxxxiv. 19. 263; lxxxv. 9. 215; lxxxv. 12. 216; lxxxvi. 6. 129; xci. 6. 217, 269; xci. 7. 216; xcvi. 2. 129; xcix. 11. 171; cxi. 6. 250.

Exodus Rabba i. 29. 170; i. 35. 97; ii. 2. 120; ii. 5. 44, 105; v. 9. 99, 115; viii. 1. 237; xii. 1. 116; xv. 5. 139; xv. 15. 228; xv. 16. 127; xviii. 5. 74; xxi. 4. 115, 125; xxi. 13. 379; xxiii. 5. 134; xxiv. 3. 141; xxvii. 2. 97; xxviii. 61; xxviii. 6. 102, 111; xxix. 61; xxix. 1. 115; xxxii. 6. 9. 128; xxxiv. 1. 115, 118, 124; xxxvii. 8. 82

INDEX

387

- Leviticus Rabba** i. 1. 216, 377; i. 13. 276; iv. 5. 41; iv. 8. 109; viii. 2. 218, 377; ix. 9. 209, 215, 251; xvi. 2. 220; xxi. 8. 259; xxiii. 98; xxiii. 12. 103; xxvii. 5. 114; xxviii. 6. 267; xxx. 2. 99; xxxii. 4. 215; xxxiv. 3. 269; xxxv. 7. 249, 272, 378; xxxvii. 3. 259
- Numbers Rabba** i. 3. 121, 129, 299; ii. 5. 57; v. 1. 105; vii. 10. 127; x. 5. 222; xi. 2. 74, 123; xi. 5. 83; xii. 3. 119, 137; xii. 6. 136, 379; xii. 8. 83; xiii. 6. 118, 291, 301; xv. 2. 5. 83; xv. 10. 267, 377; xv. 21. 229; xvii. 2. 283; xix. 18. 99; xx. 1. 275; xx. 7. 276; xx. 18. 237; xx. 19. 184; xxi. 16. 86
- Deuteronomy Rabba** i. 17. 105; ii. 1. 324; ii. 10. 18, 39, 110; ii. 16. 130; ii. 37. 115; iv. 4. 144; v. 13. 149; vi. 14. 378; vii. 2. 123; vii. 8. 100; ix. 9. 148; xi. 3. 84
- Song of Songs Rabba** i. 91, 110; i. 3. 147; i. 4. 170; ii. 94, 99, 125, 184; ii. 9. 289; iii. 8. 85; iv. 10. 352; vi. 136; vi. 3. 148; vii. 5. 317; viii. 261, 267; viii. 3. 377; viii. 12. 71, 229, 231
- Ruth Rabba** ii. 265; iv. 12. 220; v. 4. 111
- Lamentations Rabba** i. 5. 389; i. 33. 133; i. 45. 228; xxv. 106, 116, 121; xxix. 133
- Koheleth Rabba** i. 2. 378; iv. 2. 287; viii. 3. 86; x. 17. 237; xiv. 16. 216
- Esther Rabba** x. 4. 232
- Sifri** (edit. Friedmann):
on **בְּשָׂר**, 83, 141; **Numbers** vi. 27. 172; on **בְּרוּלִיק**, 107, 133, 141, 148; on **כְּסֵף**, 133; on **יְהוָה**, 387; on **צָרָעָה**, 119; on **בְּנֵי**, 112; on **Deut.** xxiii. 14. 297; on **Deut.** xxxii. 5. 189; on **Deut.** xxxiv. 10. 277; on **אֶתְנָהָה**, 71, 91, 147, 231
- Mechilta** (edit. Friedmann):
page 1. 148; page 33. 274; on **בְּנֵי**, 109; on **בְּשִׁׁירָה**, 90, 107, 183, 235, 280, 290, 378; on **Exodus** xvi. 25. 88; on **בְּרִית**, 44, 86, 97, 99, 114, 115, 116
- Tanhuma**:
Genesis i. 1. 144; בְּרָאָתִים, 302; **לְלֹא**, 91; לְלֹא, 102, 115; חִילּוּתָה, 226; יְוִישָׁב, 97; יְוִישָׁלָם, 222; יְהִי, 133; וְאַרְאָה, 226; בָּא, 148; גַּשְׁלָה, 90, 107, 134, 379; תְּרוּ, 97, 115; מְשֻׁפְטִים, 42; מְשֻׁפְטָם, 227; תְּרוּמָה, 121, 125; בְּיִצְאָה, 84, 102, 116; פְּקֻדָּה, 118, 136, 379; יְמָאָה, 227; תְּרוּעָה, 44, 141; vi. 18; שְׁמָנִים, 228; בְּגָדָר, 101, 140; אֲחָרִיָּתָה, 94; בְּגָדָר, 101, 140; בְּגָדָר, 93, 381; נְזָאָה, 84, 116; נְלָמָד, 273; תְּרִמָה, 97, 265; נְלָמָד, 265; בְּגָדָר, xxiii. 4. 234; פְּנִיחָה, 86, 380; נְתָנָה, 107, 222; בְּגָדָר, 381; אֲבָיוֹם, 144
- Falkbut**:
- לְלֹא, 372; **Genesis** xl ix. 208; בָּא, 134; **Exodus** xxxi. 115; שְׁפָטִים, 118; **Numbers** iii. 15. 107; בְּרוּלִיק, 96, 134; **Deut.** i. 265; יְהִי, 132, 387; **Joshua** v. 181; vii. 265; xxii. 86; **Judges** iv. 4. 277; 1 Sam. i. 28. 265; 2 Sam. xx. 144; xx. 22. 265; xxii. 270; 1 Kings viii. 122, 125; xvii. 133; 2 Kings ii. 266; **Isaiah** vi. 112; xxv. 8. 95; xxxv. 95; xli. 97; **Jeremiah** i. 5. 235; x. 379; xxiii. 24. 112; li. 91; **Ezekiel** i. 123, 148; viii. 137; xxxvi. 139; xxxvi. 20. 134; xl iii. 89; **Hosea** xi. 3. 235; **Micah** v. 267; **Jonah** i. 378; **Psalms** i. 69; vii. 237; viii. 86; xiv. 86; xvii. 99, 208; xxiv. 218, 287; xxxvii. 314; lxviii. 144; lxxii. 89; lxxxii. 144; lxxxvi. 44; xci. 124, 288; cii. 292; civ. 89; **Proverbs** xx. 133; **Job** xx. 27. 92; xxiii. 381; xxxvii. 144; xxxviii. 381; **Song of Songs** i. 94, 149; i. 2. 144; ii. 6. 380; ii. 27. 92; vi. 2. 184; **Lamentations** ii. 125; iii. 144; iii. 8. 139; vii. 27. 236; viii. 86; **Esther** v. 2. 270; vi. 140
- Pesikta Rabbati** (edit. Friedmann):
p. 6. 237; 21. 187; 129. 235; 161. 171; 189. 86
- Pesikta De R. Kahana** (edit. Buber):
p. 80. 143; 105. 296
- Midrash Tillim**:
Ps. xvii. 216; lxxii. 216; lxxiv. 171; xc. 381; xci. 137
- Tanna Debe Eliyahu**:
- לְלֹא, 92
- Pirke R. Eliezer**:
iii. 171

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, Edinburgh.

